

3

INFANT BAPTISM
4428. 32.
Gods Ordinance :

PART II.

WHEREIN

The Antiquity of Infant Church-Membership and Baptism is Clearly Proved both from the Scriptures and Fathers : Proving the *Anabaptists* Plea of Antiquity to be a meer Untruth. As also, That Dipping is not the right way of Baptizing.

TOGETHER

With a Seasonable Rebuke of several Erroneous Opinions the *Arminian Anabaptists* hold concerning Original Sin, Universal and sufficient Grace, Redemption, Free-Vill, Perseverance, &c.

Being an Answer,

To several Scandalous and Erroneous Papers put out by the *Anabaptists* ; and particularly, Mr. Collins of Wapping his late Book, Entituled, *The Sandy-foundation of Infant-Baptism shaken*, against Mr. Mence (late of Wapping) and me.

By MICHAEL HARRISON, Minister of the Gospel in Potters Pury in Northamptonshire.

L O N D O N,

Printed for Tho. Cockerill Sen. and Jun. at the Three Legs in the Poultry, over-against the Stocks-Market.
1696.

GOVERNMENT

PART II

WHEREAS

The duty of the Church is to

maintain a pure and holy

and righteous and

to the glory of God

and the good of the

371.

4419.1.

THE
EPISTLE
TO THE
READER.

Christian Reader,

HOW exceeding Troublesome the Anabaptists have been to all our Godly Reformers; and how much they have hardened the Churches Enemies, and hindered the Reformation, all cannot but know that have almost any acquaintance with Books: And what bitter Enemies they have been to the Work of God, and the Orthodox Doctrine of all Protestant Churches, by me taught, the whole Countrey have been spectators. They have most maliciously charged me with Preaching Popish Doctrine; denying the Lord; and bringing in damnable Heresies; and when they have been call'd to make good their Charge, thus they do it, viz. I am for the Baptizing of Infants; I say, Christ did not dye for all alike, &c. These Malicious Slanders, which
A 2
struck

The Epistle to the Reader.

struck at all Protestant Churches, I Answered in a Publick Assembly, before a considerable number of their Teachers, who bewrayed their Weakness, Ignorance, and Unfitness for that Sacred Work of Preaching the Gospel, which many justly fear they have neither Ability nor Commission for.

They are a People strangely alienated from the spirit of the Gospel, which is Love: He that loveth not his brother abideth in death: Yet they have, in hatred and opposition to all Christian Churches, unchurched all, saying, None are Ministers, Churches, or Christians, but those only that are Dipt in Baptizing; and look on all others, as their Oracle Mr. Everard told Mr. Swain Minister of Withybrook, That he look'd on him and his People to be no Brethren, but Pagans.

My Book, Infant-baptism Gods Ordinance, has extreamly vexed them, though it has been (through Grace) of great use to many; and I have received the Thanks of several Worthy Ministers for it.

As for Mr. Collins's Answer to Mr. Mences Book and mine, it's generally lookt upon, by all Men of Sense, so weak, that it scarcely deserves any Reply to be made to it: The very reading of it has given some very good Arguments against Anabaptism. And had not God removed that good Man, Mr. Mence, out of the way, I should have wholly left the matter to him; but God having removed him where their Clamours can vex and disquiet him no more, I shall endeavour to show Mr. Collins to be a weak unthinking Man to the unprejudiced Reader. I was with Mr. Mence the day before his Death; and though his Spirits were

The Epistle to the Reader.

were very low, yet he discoursed freely, for about half an hour, of the very foul and unchristian Carriage of Mr. Collins and his followers, which he seem'd to resent with great indignation : But I shall not recite what he then spoke, but rather give you Mr. Collins's Character, as drawn up by Mr. Mence in the beginning of his Weakness, in a Letter sent to me.

Reverend Sir,

I Received yours, and am much grieved that I cannot have the happiness of seeing you at the time and place appointed : The Reason is, viz. It hath pleased the Lord, for some Months, to visit me with great Illness and Weakness of Body, infomuch that I am at present brought very low, therefore my Friends have prevailed with me to leave my Studies and Preaching for some time. Mr. Shutes Man was mistaken in his saying I had answered Collins's Book, which was conveyed to me by the proud Author, who was so impudent as to send one to you. He is the proudest, the ignorantest, and the most abusive person I ever met with : His late Book is much exploded by all of any competent understanding, that have read it. I intend when I return (if the Lord please) to Reply to his pitiful Answer to my Book. Some time after I had Printed my Book, he sent out a Lying, Slandrous Paper against me, which is Printed again in this his last Book, to which I have in Print given a full Answer. I have here presented you with one of my Books on the Covenant, which many able Ministers have been pleased

The Epistle to the Reader.

to return me their Thanks for ; adding, my Arguments are unanswerable. This Book hath sorely vexed the *Anabaptists*, but (by the blessing of the Lord) hath been of great use to many good People.

I hope you will be pleased to send forth some suitable Reply to Collins's foolish Answer to your Book. He will not (I trust) proceed much farther ; for his folly is like to be manifest to all Men, he hath an ignorant, malicious, and lying Crue that follow him. The Lord bless you in all your Labours and Indeavours for our dear Lord Jesus.

Your unworthy Brother,

June 4. 1695.

Francis Mence.

Some may perhaps think this Language too sharp ; but let such know, that Mr. Mence had been provoked to a very high degree ; He no doubt very well knew the spirit and character of Mr. Collins and his followers : Such a Character would not be so acceptable from any other. And let the Anabaptists know, that however they had traduced Mr. Mence (as I was informed by Mr. Mence, and those about him, the day before his Death) for Acting, Preaching and Printing, against his Conscience, whatever had been done or said against them ; and that the revenging Hand of God was upon him in this Consumptive Disease he now lay under. That all this was a Malicious Slander ; he verily believed it was (*causa Dei*) Gods Cause, and resolved to have
pro-

The Epistle to the Reader.

prosecuted it, if God had pleased to restore him.

And I have met with much the like dealing from Men of the same Denomination ; and perhaps more foul : For what more than to be guilty of Damnable Heresies ; to be an Antichrist, &c. And when these Malignant Slanders light directly upon all Protestants, Ministers, Churches and Christians throughout the World ; nay, these Charges and Slanders light as directly upon the greatest number, and best part of the Anabaptists themselves ; viz. The Particulars, who in other things, except Baptism, heartily joyn with us, and we with them.

It is much my grief to see persons pretending to some degrees of Christianity more pure than others ; to be so estranged from that without which Religion must quickly expire.

But how much more doleful is it, when those Hearts that should be breathing out love to Christ and his Saints, are fill'd with a blind raging Zeal for their own Opinions, which are directly opposite to the Gospel ! What need had we to pray for that blessed time, when the Church shall no more be troubled with such pricking Bryars, and wounding Thornes ! Isa. 35. 9, 10. No lion shall be there, nor any ravenous beast shall go up thereon, it shall not be found there : but the redeemed shall walk there. The ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs. Such a time is coming, let us pray for it.

As for the Work before you, I shall say nothing to commend it ; only tell you, it is partly extorted from me by the importunity of Friends, and partly the clamorous and unruly Carriage of those

The Epistle to the Reader.

those of the other perswasion. And whatever any may think, I can comfortably appeal to God that knows my Heart, that my end is the Glory of God, the establishment of weak Christians, and silencing Gainsayers. I'm satisfied what I have said is Truth; I have offered nothing rashly, but every Sentence has been deliberately weighed, before exposed to publick view. I have some Scandalous Papers put into my hands by Persons of that Perswasion which I had thought to have now Published, but considering it would expose some of my Neighbours, I shall forbear at present to do it. If any say I have dealt and spoke too sharply; let such know I have spoken the words of Truth and Soberness, and do dearly love the Persons while I tax their Errours, and can heartily own aliquid Christi, any thing of Christ in any of them. I have much more Charity for them than they have for me. They disown all Ministers, Churches and Christians, that like not their Dipping trade; saying, such are no Ministers, Christians, or Churches of Christ; as you will find made good in the following Discourse, and which they publickly owned in a Meeting, where were Ten or Twelve of their Teachers, and a numerous croud of Anabaptists, besides many others, Feb. 3. 1695. We are really no others than a company of Pagans in their Eyes, as Everard confessed.

I confess when I first began to read Mr. Clarges Preface to Mr. Collins's Book, and heard the Man plead so seriously (as I hop'd) for Love and Holiness, I presently began to be taken with the Man, whatever his differing Sentiments might be;

The Epistle to the Reader.

he ; but when I perceived that it was plainly a Sect love, that was to have Anabaptism for its Object ; such a love as is found amongst Papists, Quakers, nay Mahumetans , I presently found my esteem of the Man sink into Bowels of Compassion, to think so good and excellent Expressions should only terminate on a Party : And yet more especially when I heard him give his Judgment of Mr. Mence and Mr. Collins's Books, I could not possibly avoid thinking that his Understanding was under a very false conduct, fearing that his Zeal for his New Religion, had quite darkened the use of his Understanding ; for the direct contrary to what he saith is the truth : For Mr. Mences Book hath solid Arguments, strength of Reason, and well drawn Conclusions from solid and well laid Premises ; whereas Mr. Collins's is a windy Heterodox Pamphlet, stuf with Absurdities and Mistakes ; which miserably betrays the Author to be a weak unthinking Man, whatever Stock of rash Confidence he may have.

I shall conclude with two words of Exhortation to persons of different Perswasions in the point of Baptism.

1. To such who own Infant-Baptism to be Gods Ordinance. Friends, bless God that has set you right in this Point ; you might have been as cruel to your poor Babes as others are ; but while you differ from others, differ Charitably ; have a care of bitterness of spirit if you meet with Persons of the other Perswasion, that are sound in other Points, though they are not with you in this Point, yet in other things are Sober, Serious and Conscientious ;

The Epistle to the Reader.

sciemious ; indeavouring to keep a good Conscience both towards God and Men ; and the only reason they differ from you in this, is, for want of Light. They are willing to give their Infants to Christ so far as they conceive they have Warrant so to do ; own such as Brethren ; refuse not Communion with them. For my own part I heartily joyn with Mr. Baxter, who amongst his Cases in his Christian Directory puts this as one, viz.

Q. May Anabaptists that have no other Errors be permitted in Church Communion ?

And he Answers it in the Affirmative, Yes. And tolerated in their Practice also, &c. Let us study our own Hearts, filling up the places where God has set us, in Church and Family, with a holy, humble, and becoming Conversation ; walking worthy of the Lord to all well-pleasing.

2. A word to those of the other Perswasion. You are not satisfied that your Infants have a right to Baptism ; if you were, you would devote them to Christ in that Ordinance. 'Tis true, till God enlighten your Minds in that Point, you must dissent from us ; but can you not do it Peaceably ? Must you needs Unchurch all that are not of your Mind ? Ought you not to hold Communion with us, notwithstanding this difference ? I do perswade myself, that you that differ from us in nothing but Baptism, will not break Communion for these little things. Be humble, and will to know the mind of God : The humble he will teach.

As for the Arminian Anabaptists, I have less hopes of them ; and yet I would seriously offer them this, Whether those Erroneous Opinions, such
as,

The Epistle to the Reader.

as, To deny Original Sin ; that Christ dyed for all alike ; that all have universal and sufficient Grace ; that saving Grace may be lost, &c. which you hold in common with Papists, Socinians, Pelagians, Arminians, and other condemned Hereticks, and which have been constantly opposed by all sound Divines in every Age of the Church, and are now contrary to the Confessions of all Protestant Churches in the Christian World ; is it not your Duty to suspect them ? And as upon tryal they will appear false and dangerous, it will be your Duty to reject them.

To conclude, I intreat you, that if you have any love for Jesus Christ, Truth, the Churches Peace, and your own Souls, lay aside all Bitterness, Contention and Strife, and put on Love, Bowels and Meekness ; and if you must differ, differ Peaceably : Devest not your selves of all Charity for those that oppose your Opinions ; who without dispute are the purest, the holiest, and the soundest Churches in the World. But if you resolve to go on, in Speaking and Writing, against your Brethren ; nay, against the Ordinances and Institutions of Christ, and the plain avowed Doctrine of the Gospel ; for certain know, Jesus Christ, whom you ignorantly oppose, will be too hard for you, and he will spirit and raise up ever, in every Age, some who will both oppose and expose your Errors.

For mine own part, I am weary of this kind of work ; I heartily wish this may be the last time that I shall ever be seen in Print upon this occasion, hoping the Controversie will now fall to the ground, and that none will have a Heart to re-vive

The Epistle to the Reader.

vive it ; however let them know for certain, that we cannot stand still while we see our dear Babes thrust out of the Church, and set amongst Pagans and Infidels, and the Charter of our Salvation, the Covenant of Grace, torn in pieces, and set aside as an old, useless, antiquated Covenant ; but we must speak in that cause that's Christs, as well as our own. That we may all attain a sound Judgment, and a serious Heart, is, and shall ever be, the Hearty Prayer of yours in the Gospel of Christ,

Michael Harrison.

THE

The CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

Proving that Anabaptism is a new thing ; and that the Anabaptists can claim no Antiquity for their way beyond 1521, Nicholas Stock being their first Founder : Wherein there is a short History of the Beginning and Progress of the Anabaptists in Germany, with their Erroneous Opinions. The Anabaptists pretence to Antiquity, proved meer Forgery ; the Fathers and Primitive Churches being for Infant-Baptism.

CHAP. II.

Proving Gen. 17. 7. to be the Covenant of Grace by eight Arguments. Nine Arguments proving Infant-Baptism Gods Ordinance.

CHAP. III.

Proving Acts 2. 39. The promise is to you and to your Children, &c. is the Promise of God to Abraham, Gen. 17. 7. wherein is proved, That Children were and are to be Church-Members under every Dispensation ; that the Gospel is so far from revoking former Grants, that it settles them in all their former Privileges. The New Testament contains plain Precepts for the Baptizing of Infants. That to deny Infants right to the Covenant and Baptism is false and dangerous Doctrine.

CHAP.

The CONTENTS.

CHAP. IV.

Shewing the right Mode of Baptizing is not Dipping, but Pouring, Sprinkling, or otherwise applying Water. That the words Baptiso, Baptisma, Baptimos, do not necessarily signifie to Dip or Plunge. No Scripture Proof that ever John the Baptist or the Apostles Baptized any by Dipping the whole Body in Water: With several Arguments, proving Dipping is not Gods Ordinance.

CHAP. V.

Proving that the Anabaptists have revived several old condemned Heresies; viz. They deny Original Sin; that Christ dyed for all alike; that God affords all universal and sufficient Grace; that Saints in Christ may fall away finally, and be eternally damned. They disown all others from being Ministers, Christians or Churches of Christ, but themselves. They destroy the Ministry, &c. The contrary Truths cleared.

THE Reader is desired to Pardon and Correct the Infirmitie of the Press, which by Reason of the Authors distance, he could not do himself.

INFANT.

INFANT BAPTISM

Gods Ordinance.

CHAP. I.

Proving that Anabaptism is a new thing, and the Anabaptists can claim no Antiquity for their way beyond Nicholas Stock their first Founder, 1521, with Answers to their Pretence for Antiquity.

A Nabaptism, now so much cryed up by many, as if it were a Plant from Heaven, is nevertheless but of yesterday, and all the Antiquity it can lay claim to is not Two Hundred Years, the first Anabaptist in the World being one *Nicholas Stock*, or as others, *Stork*, a German, and a blasphemous Heretick, who about the Year 1521 or 1522, began to disgorge his Malice against the Baptizing of Infants, and that Dipping was the only way of Baptizing. He pretended to Dreams and Visions, as also converse with Angels, to countenance his New Religion; and in the Carcase of this unclean Beast was bred a multitude of stinging Insects, such as *Muncer*, *Matthias*, *Kniperdoling*, *John of Leyden*, *Michael Servetus*, *John Hut*, *David George*, *Socinus*, &c. who faneying themselves inspired from above, most confidently uttered their Heretical Blasphemies, which were,

1. That no Infant ought to be Baptized.

B

2. None

2. None were rightly Baptized but such as were Dipped.

3. That Magistrates were not to be suffered in the Church : No Christian ought to be a Magistrate.

4. That it was unlawful to take an Oath.

5. That there ought to be no difference between the Clergy and Laity, that every one that had Gifts might Preach and Administer the Sacraments.

6. That there is no Original Sin.

7. That Man hath Free Will.

8. That the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are not Three distinct Persons, and in Nature and Essence One God. They made every Saint equal with Christ ; that Christ is not God.

9. They denied that the Souls of the Godly or Wicked went to Heaven or Hell till the day of Judgment.

10. That the Visible Church consists of those which are perfect, and of them only.

11. That Universities, Schools, and Human Arts, ought not to be.

12. The *Anabaptists*, called *Libertines*, denied the Scriptures to be the Word of God, and singing of Psalms.

13. That a Man was not tyed to one Wife, therefore their Fairy King *John Bebold* had Fifteen together.

14. That none were to be owned as Christians or Churches of Christ, but themselves only.

15. That we must become as little Children in childish actions : Therefore they would play with Rattles, ride on Hobby-horses, and wallow in their own Dung in imitation of Children.

16. That *Luther* and the Protestant Ministers were worse than the Pope, carnal Preachers, &c. with much more of the like kind.

I would not have all these things charged upon our *English Anabaptists*, but the 1. and 2. they all own. The 1. 2. 6. 7. 11. 12. which concern Singing, 14. 16. are generally owned by the *Arminian Anabaptists*, though there may be some few that may dissent in some things: moreover many of them own the 3. 4. and 5. yea the 8. and 9.

Nicholas Stock, and the Leaders of the *Anabaptists*,

tists, in Preaching up these vile Doctrines, and pretending Dreams, Visions and Revelation, with thundering out fearful Curses against all that would not obey, did so amuse and terrifie the unthinking ignorant Country People, that in the space of a few Years, *Germany* was fill'd with *Anabaptists*; and when ever they heard the Reformation was begun in any City, thither they flock'd, not troubling any Popish City. Where ever they came they thundered against Magistracy and Ministry; and where they prevailed, pull'd them down, turning all into uproar and confusion. Many wicked pranks they played which exceedingly hardened the Papists, and hindered the Reformation, and much grieved the spirits of those Godly Reformers, whose very names are deservedly honoured by the Churches of Christ, viz. *Calvin*, *Luther*, *Bullenger*, *Musculus*, *Oecolampadius*, *Melancthon*, &c. who have therefore given us the History of the German *Anabaptists*.

They formed a universal Empire; made *John Becold*, otherwise called *John of Leyden*, their King, fixing the head of their Monarchy at *Munster*, a City in *Westphalia*; but at last they were trodden down like mire in the streets, One Hundred Thousand of them perishing in those confusions which themselves had caused. Various attempts they made in several places, but with ill success, most of their Leaders being taken and executed, very few of them dying a Natural Death. Their last attempt was to have made themselves Masters of *Amsterdam*, but their design miscarrying they were scattered to every corner. Two Ships laden with *Anabaptists* escaped to *England*, where they have nested ever since, endeavouring to propagate *Anabaptism*.

The great injury the Reformation received by the *Anabaptists* in *Germany*, and other parts abroad, caused many excellent Divines, as *Calvin*, *Luther*, *Bullenger*, *Chemnitius*, &c. to write the Histories of the *Anabaptists*, to warn other Countries to take heed of the like mischiefs. Those that would know more of this, may read the aforesaid Authors, and in *English*, *Dr. Featly* and *Mr. Rutherford*, besides many others.

But though what I have said be really the truth, yet the *Anabaptists* of our dayes have pleaded Antiquity,

pretending that the *Novatians* and *Donatists*, yea the ancient *Waldensians* and *Britains* were *Anabaptists*.

To this purpose Mr. Henry Danvers, a confident Man, pretends to search Antiquity ; and though Mr. Danvers has been proved guilty of notorious forgery by Mr. Wills and Mr. Baxter. yet Mr. H. Collins confidently transcribes from him, as if he were an unerring Oracle. He saith, *That whereas I said in my Book, (Infant-Baptism Gods Ordinance) that it hath been the constant custom of the Church of Christ all along from the Apostles dayes to baptize Infants.* He saith, *The contrary appears from the Magdeburgenses History,* quoting from Mr. Danvers, cent. 1. lib. 2. pag. 496. that in this Age they Baptized only the Adult, &c. Notoriously false ! The *Magdeburgenses* in the place cited do not say so ; these are their words, *Baptizatos esse Adultos tum Judæos tum Gentes, exempla probant ; i. e.* We have examples of Adult persons both *Jewes* and *Gentiles* ; Danvers saith, *The adult only* ; as if no Infants were baptized. They say, *The adult Jewes and Gentiles, such as were converted to Christianity, were when converted Baptized.* They do indeed say concerning Infants, *Infantum Baptismatis exempla quidem annotata non leguntur, sed Origines & Cyprianus, & alii Patres, &c.* That is, we have no particular notice given us, or Examples given us that they were Baptized, but *Origen* and *Cyprian*, and others of the Fathers that lived near the Apostles dayes, do affirm, That even in the Apostles dayes Infants were Baptized. And the *Magdeburg Writers*, whom they would make *Anabaptists*, give us several excellent Arguments for the Baptizing of Infants, too large to be here inserted ; yet who can may read them, cent. 1. lib. 2. chap. 4. pag. 354. and lib. 1. chap. 4. pag. 152. And they also give us an account of the *Greek* and *Latin* Fathers that lived in the first Ages of the Church, and witnessed, That Infants were Baptized in those early times.

Let the Reader here note, that the Writings of the first Fathers, some are wholly lost, others maimed and imperfect, as the two first Fathers *Polycarpus* and *Ignatius*, who were Disciples to the Apostles, there is scarcely any thing of theirs extant ; and their immediate successors, *Ireneus* and *Justin Martyr*, the latter living
in

in *St. Johns* dayes, and *Ireneus* within Forty or Forty Three Years after, as *Mr. Baxter* proves.

Ireneus writ many things, but all is lost except one Volumn, and so of others; so that we not having all their Writings, they might say much more for Infant-Baptism than we can produce. Moreover, their Work lay with the Heathen, telling us how they preached to, converted and baptized the *Pagans*; so 'tis no wonder that there is in some of them so deep a silence concerning Infants, seeing neither in the *Apostles* dayes, nor for many Hundred Years after, the right of Infants to Church Membership and Baptism was never called in question by any, Infants having been settled peaceably in their right ever since *Abrahams* time; yet in their broken Writings there's enough to assure us, Infants were baptized in the very early dayes of the Church.

1. *Justin Martyr*, whom the *Anabaptists* confidently cite as on their side, whereas, as I said before, he dealt principally with the Heathen, and tells us how they dealt with adult converted *Pagans*: What does this concern Infant-Baptism? Yet there are sufficient hints in *Justin Martyrs* Writings that he was for the baptizing of Infants, as *Mr. Baxter* and *Mr. Wills* have proved, to which I refer the Reader; only I will here insert a passage out of *Mr. Cobet* of *New-England*, who tells us, *Justin Martyr* understood *John 3. 5.* Except a man be born of water, &c. of Baptism; for speaking of our nature and birth, Sin, i. e. Original Sin, (which the *Anabaptists* deny) he pleads the necessity of Regeneration in and by Baptism, as the ordinary way, pleading for it *John 3. 5.* and whether he rightly understand this Text or no, is not material, his Argument is altogether as conclusive for the baptizing of Infants as adult persons.

2. And then as to *Ireneus*, he had seen *Policarpus*, *St. Johns* Disciple; we have his testimony for Infant-Baptism, *lib. 2. advers. hareses*, speaking of Infants being born again by the laver of Regeneration, viz. Baptism, And again, saith he, *Christ came to save all sorts. Qui per eum renascuntur in Deum infantes*, All that are born to God, Infants, little ones. Born to God in the Ecclesiastical Phrase, is but the same for Infant-Baptism.

3. Witness is *Tertullian*, who lived in the first Hundred years after the Apostles; he saith in his Book, *De Anima*, That the Children of the Faithful are holy by birth; which is the same the Apostle saith 1 Cor. 7. 13. which is the very Argument Protestants now use for Infant-Baptism. This *Tertullian* did move some Scruples concerning Infant-Baptism; and in case there was no danger of Death, was for delaying Baptism till the Child was three or four years old, but he never denied the lawfulness of it; and in case the Infant was in danger of Death, did vehemently urge it: And yet the *Anabaptists* have the impudence to cite *Tertullian* against Infant-Baptism.

4. Witness is *Origen*, who lived in the Year 200, and therefore in the very next Age after the Apostles; so that it would be strange if he should not know what was done in the Apostles days. In his Commentary on *Rom. 6.* he cites the words of *David*, *Psal. 51. 5. I was born in iniquity, &c.* He adds, *Propter hoc Ecclesia ab Apostolis traditionem accepit parvulis dare Baptismum; i. e.* for this Reason, i. e. Because they are born in Original Sin, the Church hath received a Tradition from the Apostles to administer Baptism to Infants. And in his Commentary on *Luke, tom. 2. hom. 14.* he saith, *Little Children are to be Baptized for the remission of Sins.*

5. Witness is *Cyprian*, who lived above forty or fifty years after *Origen*, that is in 248. He uses this Argument for Infant-Baptism, *viz. Infantes circumcidebantur ergo Baptizandi; i. e.* Infants were Circumcised, therefore they ought to be Baptized. And learned *Tossanus* in his Synopsis of the Fathers, tells us that in his 8. epist. lib. 3. he affirms, *Infantes statim esse Baptizandos, ne pereant quod eis misericordia non sit deneganda;* that is, That Infants must forthwith be baptized lest they perish, because Mercy is not to be denied them. And in his Epistle to *Fidus*, he gives us the judgment of an African Counsel of 66 Bishops, whereof he was one, who met to resolve a Case put by *Fidus*, viz. Whether Infants might be Baptized before the eighth day, because Circumcision was not to be administered till then. And they agreed that, *Infantes recens nati*, new born might be baptized.

6. Witness is *Nazianzen*, he was much what of *Tertullians* mind, for delaying Baptism in case there was no fear

fear of Death, but in case of Death to baptize presently. Yea, in his 4. *orat.* he owns it absolutely in these words, *Hast thou a young Child, let it be baptized from an Infant, &c.* Besides all these, there are many other Fathers whose Testimonies might be brought, as *Chrysostome, Basil, Jerome, Maxentius, Gregory the Great*: But I shall conclude by only naming a

7. Witness *St. Austin*, who lived something more than twenty five years after the death of *St. John*. The *Anabaptists* pretend he brought in Infant-Baptism; but that's very false, for *Origen* lived above one hundred and fifty years before him. Now *St. Austin* doth not only tell us it was practised in his time, but we have his testimony that Infant-Baptism had been ever practised in the Church from the Apostles dayes: *Lib. 10.* saith he, *Consuetudo Matris Ecclesiae in Baptizandis puerulis non spernanda est; nec omnino credenda esset nisi Apostolica esset Traditio*; that is, The Custom of our Mother the Church is not to be despised in baptizing Infants; neither were it at all to be believed were it not an Apostolical Tradition.

Let not the Reader here be startled at the word Tradition; for though sometimes the word is taken in an ill sense for an innovation in Gods Worship, so Papists have many unwarrantable Traditions; but it's in Scripture taken in a good sense for an Ordinance or Doctrine taught by the Apostles, as *1 Cor. 11. 2.* it's translated *Ordinances*, and *2 Thess. 2. 15.* the same word is rendered *Tradition*. So *Austin* and *Origen* by Tradition mean an Ordinance received from the Apostles. Thus is there not any one Testimony for them out of the Fathers or *Magdeburgenses*, but all against them; so that their infatuation is very great to plead Antiquity.

They do indeed plead the *Donatists, Waldenses*, and old *Britains*, as if they were all *Anabaptists*, but it's altogether false. The *Donatists* were for rebaptizing such as had been baptized by Hereticks. The *Waldenses* and old *Britains* refused to baptize according to the manner of degenerate *Rome*, for which the Papists traduce and slander them. They may as well say the Church of *England*, the Church of *Scotland*, of *Holland, Geneva, &c.* are all *Anabaptists*, because they have laid aside the Popish Mode of Baptizing. Thus they have most wickedly

slandered the Fathers, the Donatists, Waldenses, and old British Saints. Mr. Wills and Mr. Baxter have largely detected the Forgeries of Henry Danvers upon this subject. Mr. Baxter has a Book bearing this Title, viz. *A confutation of the strange Forgeries of Mr. H. Danvers against the Antiquity of Infant-Baptism*. And indeed well may they thus slander and belye Antiquity, when they so confidently cite our Protestant Reformers, such as Wickliff, Calvin, Luther, Melancthon, Zuinglius, Osiander, Cas-sander, Bullinger, Beza, Dr. Hammond, Dr. Taylor, Dr. Barlow, Mr. Baxter, who while he was writing against the Anabaptists, tells us he heard the Hawkers crying under his Window, *Mr. Baxters Arguments for the Baptism of Believers, and against Infant-Baptism*. Nay my self, as Mr. Collins fancies, hath furnished them with an excellent Argument for Anabaptism; because I said, *There were no Anabaptists in the Apostles dayes, nor of many hundred years after*. Thus Ignorance, Impudence, and a stock of vile Confidence makes Men they neither care what they do or say.

But what can they by all their Art gather out of Protestant Authors for Anabaptism?

Answer, Why a false Witness will make a Man speak what was never in his thoughts, as Mr. Danvers does the *Magdeburgenses*, cent. 1. he confidently saith, *That in this Century the custom of Dipping was changed into Sprinkling, &c.* whereas there is not one word, as Mr. Wills observes, in the whole cent. 1. to that purpose.

Sometimes they pervert the sayings of Learned, Godly men. As when *Tertullian*, *Athanasius*, and others speak how the Church usually dealt with Pagans, *first taught them, and then baptized them*: And so Mr. Baxter, *None but disciples ought to be baptized*. Now this is enough to make Mr. Baxter an Anabaptist; for say they, *Infants are not disciples*: But Mr. Baxter proves Infants to be disciples, therefore they ought to be baptized.

Are not all the Protestant Churches in the World for the baptizing Believers, whoever denied it? All we have mentioned would not baptize a Turk or a Jew till he believed, but would first instruct him in the Principles of Christ.

What is this to the baptizing of Infants, only such stuff as this will serve to raise a dust, and blind the eyes of

of an ignorant Reader. To conclude this Chapter, I shall only insert some passages of Mr. Baxter, which dropt from him in much grief upon the reading of the notorious Forgeries and Slanders of Mr. Danvers concerning Antiquity.

“ I am (saith he) ashamed for the dulness of my own
 “ Heart, that it doth not with floods of compassionate
 “ tears lament the pitiful condition of the seduced that
 “ must be thus deceived in the dark : And of the
 “ Church of God that must be thus assaulted by such
 “ inhumane means : The Book being composed in that
 “ part of History which the stress of the cause lyeth upon,
 “ of such untruths in fact and history, as I profess
 “ it's one of my greatest difficulties to know how to
 “ call them. Should I say as they are so notorious and
 “ shameless (as I say not) that a *Turk* or *Pagan* would
 “ have blushed to have been guilty of but some Page or
 “ Lines of them ; and much more a man of any tenderness
 “ of Conscience.

“ It grieves me much that the Souls of poor Christians,
 “ should be under the temptations of such Writings,
 “ where notorious untruths in matters of fact are reported
 “ and justified.

And afterwards Mr. Baxter puts these Queries to Mr. Danvers, which (because Mr. Collins so confidently transcribes and reports) I again here offer them to Mr. Collins to be thought on at his leisure.

1. Whether the untruths in matters of fact you so confidently publish be not of so stupendious a magnitude as should have frightened the Conscience of a *Turk* or *Pagan*? When no less than four whole bodies of men are so slandered by you, the *Donatists*, the *Novatians*, the *Waldenses*, and the old *Britains*, each of them containing it's like many hundred thousands, and when so many whole books are falsified.

2. Whether you do not much more by such notorious Scandals to hinder your success, than many Writings against you could have done ?

3. Whether you are really men of tender Consciences as you would have others believe, while you cannot endure our Infant-blessings, and yet can swallow such Camels as these ?

4. Whe-

4. Whether it's probable that such notorious Forgers and Slanderers should know more of Gods mind in the point of Baptism, than all the sober, holy, learned Christian World for so many hundred years?

5. Can you expect to be believed in other things, that can to deliberately forge and slander in this?

6. Is it likely that God should bless such unmanly Scandals as this to the Churches good, unless as Sin by an over-ruling Providence may occasion good?

7. Is not this a scandal to your Rebaptized Churches, to be so polluted, and to have so loose a discipline, as to suffer such a member as you in it, without either bringing you to Confession and Repentance, or casting you out by Excommunication? Have our loosest Societies in England greater Scandals and more scandalous members. Thus far Mr. Baxter.

Now you have had it made clear, that notwithstanding all the brags and boasts of Antiquity, that *Anabaptism* is a meer novelty, and its Age but of yesterday, and its first Authors and Founders being notorious Hereticks and Blasphemers; enough to make every sober person our of love with it, and suspect it as an imposture of Satan to vex and pollute the Church.

C H A P. II.

Proving that Gen. 17. 7. (I will establish my Covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee in their generations, for an everlasting Covenant, to be a God unto thee and thy seed after thee,) is the Covenant of Grace, and from thence clear proof for Infant Church-membership and Baptism, with Answers to Mr. Collins's weak Cavils to the contrary.

IT's strange to consider with what fiery Zeal the *Anabaptists* oppose the baptizing of Infants, and with what bitterness, scorn and reproach they usually treat those that plead for it. That Infant-baptism is Gods Ordinance,

Ordinance, I have fully cleared in my Book already abroad, called, *Infant-Baptism Gods Ordinance*. I have laid down nine Arguments to prove it. One of them was, The custom of the Church in all Ages; which has been largely handled in the former Chapter. A second was,

2. If God doth own the Infant-seed of Believers as his, then they ought to receive the token of his so owning of them: but God doth so own them; *ergo*: Against this he gives no answer, but either ignorantly or maliciously raises a dust to blind the Readers eyes; *I will return*, saith he, *an Argument ad hominem*, *If God own the Infant-seed of Unbelievers, as Pagans, as his, then they ought to be Baptized? But God doth, &c.* Ezek. 18. *All souls are mine*; *ergo*, none, arguing; I say, *The Children of Believers*: He saith, *The Children of Pagans*. I speak of Gods owning us in Covenant, and our Children, and thence infer a right to the Seal: He speaks of Gods owning us as Creatures. Is there any congruity between a Covenant-right and a Creature-right? Or doth he not rather mean that those I call, *Believers in Covenant*, are in his eyes but a company of *Pagans*, and can claim no other right than what a *Pagan* may do? This is their Principle, as I shall prove in due place. My

3. Argument for Infant-Baptism was this, If the Infants of believing Parents ought to be received as visible Church-members, then they ought to be baptized: but the former is true, therefore the latter. This I shall more fully prosecute by and by.

4. Argument was, If any Infants are Christs Disciples, then those Infants ought to be baptized: but some Infants are Disciples, *Acts* 15. 10. therefore, &c.

To this they confidently reply, Infants cannot be Christs Disciples because they cannot be taught, *Mat.* 28. 18. and because they cannot take up Christs Cross and follow him. As for *Matthew*, the words are, *Μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, word for word saith Learned Leigh from the *Greek*, *Go make them disciples*. Infants are a great part of Nations, therefore Infants are Disciples, and may and have born Christs Cross. My

5. Argument, If the Children of believing Parents are in the Covenant of Grace, and the promises of the
Covenant

Covenant belongs to them, then they ought to be baptized : but the former is true, *ergo*, the latter, *Acts* 2. 39. This I shall more fully prosecute and clear in the next Chapter. My

6 Argument was, If the Infants of one or both believing Parents be federally holy, then they ought to be baptized : but the former is true, *1 Cor.* 7. 14. Their Cavil is this, *Holiness is only legitimacy, not bastards*, hath been so often answered that 'tis needless to repeat.

7. If the Infants of believing Parents belong to the Kingdom of Heaven, then they ought to be baptized : but the former is true, *Mat.* 19. 14. *ergo*, the latter.

8. If Infants are to be received in Christs Name, then they ought to be baptized in Christs Name : but the former is true, *Mark* 9. 39.

9. If in our Saviours time the Head and Master of a Family was never baptized but his whole Family was baptized with him, then Infants ought to be baptized ; for they are a considerable part of Families : but the former is true, *Acts* 10. *Acts* 16. *1 Cor.* 1. 14.

These nine Arguments were handled and cleared in my former Book : And I humbly conceive that one of them has truth and weight sufficient to prove, that some Infants have right to Baptism : but by Gods help I shall yet give farther light by removing the snares and stumbling blocks out of the way, which the *Anabaptists* have industriously thrown in our way to make us stumble.

The main Scripture that lyes in their way is *Gen.* 17. 7. if that be the Covenant of Grace, or a meer branch of it, it infallibly ruins all their Objections against Infant Church-membership and Baptism : For if Infants have been by Gods own appointment taken into the Church as visible Church-members, by vertue of the Covenant of Grace, and the promises of the Covenant belongs to them, and this priviledge settled on them by an unchangeable and everlasting Covenant, then it follows beyond all contradiction, that it is notorious wickedness to cast out, or plead for the casting such Infants out of the Church ; but this is true, that some Infants were so taken in, and such priviledges settled on them, therefore the consequence is unavoidable, if *Gen.* 17. 7. be the Covenant of Grace.

But

But *Gen. 17. 7.* is neither the Covenant of Works nor a Covenant of Peculiarity (otherwise than the Covenant of Grace may be call'd so) but the very Covenant of Grace made with the Church through Jesus Christ.

1. I shall answer their Objection.

2. I shall prove it to be the Covenant of Grace.

1. I shall answer Objections which the *Anabaptists* weakly urge against *Gen. 17. 7.* from being the Covenant of Grace.

(1.) Mr. Collins saith, *The Covenant, Gen. 17. 7. is broken, and turns us to Zach. 11. 10, 11. therefore it cannot be the Covenant of Grace.*

Ans. The *Anabaptists* run themselves and Hearers into strange absurdities by their mistaking the Nature of the Covenant of Grace. The Covenant of Grace is to be considered two manner of wayes.

1. As to its external administration; and so it takes in all that make a credible profession of Christianity, and do claim visible Church-membership. Thus all visible professed Christians are in Covenant, them and their Children.

2. There is an internal and invisible Covenanting, wherein such as are elected, *Eph. 1. 4, 5.* joyned to Christ by a living Faith and Union, *John 6. 37. John 17. 6, 9.* are comprehended. Now the Covenant, as to the internal and invisible administration of it, is not the ground of Baptism: Then we must baptize none but such as are Elected and given to Christ, and so savingly united to him: And then we must never baptize any; for in this respect they are only known to God. It is the consideration of the Covenant as to its external administration, *viz.* visible profession, or persons being visibly in Covenant, that is the ground of Baptism.

Now such as are internally in Covenant are never thrown out, *Jer. 32. 40.* All the infirmities and weaknesses of the Saints shall never make God break Covenant with them; although the rotten Doctrine which the *Anabaptists* hold of falling away from Grace, supposeth the Covenant thus considered may be broken, as I shall shew in the fifth Chapter.

But then the Covenant considered in its external administration may be broken, when persons who sometimes

times made a credible profession do apostatize finally, or not submit to such new dispensations as God tenders, they may be discovenanted; which is the case of the *Jews* at this day: And the meaning of *Zech. 11. 10, 11.* the *Jews* were externally in Covenant; they were *Abrahams* Seed, and waited for the promised Seed, which was *Christ*; but when he came they generally rejected him, and would not submit to the new Dispensation of the Covenant, so they were for their unbelief discovenanted: So the Covenant is said to be broken; not that God had fail'd to perform any thing that he had promised, but they not submitting to the Conditions were cast out: And have we not heard of *Anabaptists* that have profest to believe, and have been Dipt, and have made a credible profession in their way for some time, but have afterwards turn'd Ranters, Quakers, any thing, or rather nothing? Were not these Church-members before, and are they not now unchurch'd?

2. He objects *Rom. 9. 8.* but nothing thence can be concluded against *Gen. 17. 7.* not being the Covenant of Grace. All *Abrahams* carnal Seed were not taken into Covenant, but in *Isaac* shall thy Seed be called: And so if *Abrahams* Seed by *Isaac* become final Apostates from the Covenant, then are they the Children of the Flesh; but if they believe in *Christ* then they and their Children are *Abrahams* seed and heirs according to promise, *Acts 2. 39.*

3. He objects, *None are Christs Disciples, but such as take up the Cross of Christ.*

Answ. I have proved from *Acts 1. 10, 11.* and *Mat. 28. 19.* that Infants are Christs Disciples.

4. But, saith he, none are accounted *Abrahams* Seed under the Gospel, but such as actually believe.

Answ. True, none but them and their Infants: But what proof can he bring, *Gal. 3. last,* that proves no such things? for saith the Apostle, *If you are Christs then are you Abrahams seed:* but some Infants are Christs, therefore some Infants are *Abrahams* Seed.

5. But, saith he, the Branches are broken off, *Rom. 11. ergo, Infants are discovenanted.*

Answ. True. All those *Jews* who were visible branches in the then visible Church, and by final unbelief rejected *Christ,*

Christ, they and their Infants were broken off; but such as did believe were not broken off, but the promise continued to them and their Children, *Acts 2.*

6. He objects, *That Gen. 17. was a Covenant of Works, and Circumcision, and all the Ceremonial Law were Seals to it as a Covenant of Works.*

Ans. The plain truth is, the poor Man has such a weak Head that he knows not what in the World to make of it. Sometimes 'tis a Covenant of Works; by and by 'tis a Covenant of Circumcision; then in the next breath it's a Covenant of Peculiarity; so it seems these are terms equally understood by him. 'Tis true, there is such a thing as the Covenant of Works, though this is not it; but a Covenant of Circumcision, and a Covenant of Peculiarity, however he may hug them as Learned Notions, yet they will look extreamly ridiculous to Men of Sense: 'Tis like he'll say 'tis call'd Gods Covenant, *Gen. 17. 10. This is my covenant, &c. Circumcision is there call'd the Covenant, saith Learned Pool, by a usual Metonymy, because 'tis a Sign and Seal of the Covenant, as the Bread and Wine are said to be Christs Body and Blood; i. e. Sacramental Signs and Seals of the Body and Blood of Christ. When he saith, Circumcision is a Seal to the Covenant of Works; he might as well do, as I have read of a Popish Priest, who Preaching up Justification by Works, but could not possibly think of any way to reconcile St. Pauls Doctrine and his together, cryed out in the Pulpit, O Paul, Paul! If what thou teachest be true, that a Man is justified by Faith, without the deeds of the Law, I wish a visible confusion from Heaven may light upon me:* Which was no sooner spoke then answered.

'Tis a most lamentable case when Men in their ignorant pride, will rather fly in the face of the Spirit of God, than forgo an Errour. *St. Paul saith, Rom. 4. 11. that Circumcision was a sign and seal of the righteousness of faith, i. e. of Christ; for Faith knows no other Righteousness but that of Christ. Mr. Collins saith, it belongs to the Covenant of Works. Who shall we believe, an ignorant, rash Man, or the blessed Apostle? Judge ye. And so the Ceremonial Law, all looks at Christ, Heb. 10. 1. Heb. 9. throughout; and no wonder though he speak at this time, when he elsewhere tells us, That Transubstantiation,*

Infants in Covenant, and Infants Habitual Faith are terms equally understood by their various Professors. Sure he thinks all the whole World Fools, besides himself and a few of his own Profession ; who (I think) as little understand their own Principles as any : Transubstantiation (however erroneous) the Learned Papists very well know what they mean by it ; so Infants in Covenant, and Infants Habitual Faith, are things very well understood by Protestant Divines.

One thing that confounds the *Anabaptists* is ; they know not how to make any difference between the *Abrahamic* Covenant and that at *Sinai*, which was 400 years after. That to *Abraham* was a pure Covenant of Grace ; that at *Sinai* was mixed, partly of Works, and partly of Grace ; partly of Works, because the Law written upon Mans Heart was almost obliterated, therefore God gave the same in the Ten Commandments written in Tables of Stone which were at first written in the Fleishly Tables of the Heart. This was not a new or other Covenant than what was made with *Adam*, but only the same revived ; as the Covenant with *Abraham* was not properly a new Covenant, but a new Dispensation of the old, made *Gen. 3. 15.* This was not given now as a means of Justification, and the like, but for the discovery of Sin, *Rom. 3. 19.* and for a Rule of Life : But the *Sinai* Covenant was partly and principally a Covenant of Grace ; i. e. All the Ceremonial Law did properly belong to the Covenant of Grace, as being a School-Master to, *Bring us to Christ, Gal. 3. 24. &c.*

2. I shall now offer you some Arguments to prove that promise, *Gen. 17. 7.* is the Covenant of Grace.

Argument 1. *Gen. 17. 7.* is the Covenant of Grace ; for it must either be a Covenant of Works or a Covenant of Grace ; but a Covenant of Works it cannot be, for that requires personal perfect Obedience, and in case of Sin lays the Sinner under a Curse, *Gal. 3. 10, 12. Rom. 4. 5.* The Covenant of Works knows no mercy to the Sinner, but in this Covenant God promises himself to be a God to *Abraham* and his Seed, though they were Sinners : Therefore it's the Covenant of Grace.

Arg. 2. This phrase, *I will be thy God, &c.* is never found but in a promise of the new Covenant, as is evident

dent, Gen. 15. 1. Exod. 29. 45. Jer. 24. 7. Ezek. 11. 18, 19, 20. 2 Cor. 6. 16. Rev. 21. 3. Therefore it must needs be the Covenant of Grace.

Arg. 3. It is the Covenant of Grace, for it's an Everlasting Covenant; for the Hebrew word *Gnolam* signifies Eternity, or Everlasting, and this is one of the Glorious Properties of the Covenant of Grace, 2 Sam. 23. 5. *Although my house be not so with God; yet he hath made with me (Gnolam) an everlasting covenant.* So Isa. 24. 5. *They have broken the (Gnolam) everlasting covenant.* By which, saith Mr. Jackson, is meant the Covenant of Grace made with Abraham. So Isa. 55. 3. Isa. 61. 8. Jer. 33. 40. Ezek. 37. 26. In all which places the Hebrew word *Gnolam* is used.

Object. But (saith Mr. Collins) this Word does our Cause no service; for in this place it does not signifie Perpetuity or Eternity, but only a certain Period of Time, as the standing of the Priesthood, which is now taken down.

Ans. The Learned in the Hebrew Tongue tell us, That when *Gnolam* is used for, or of Things mutable in their own Nature, it signifies a Periodical Eternity; but when it is spoken of God, or Things Immutable and Eternal, it always signifies a Perpetual Eternity. Now the Covenant of Grace is Immutable and Eternal, therefore *Gnolam* doth here signifie a Perpetual Eternity: Neither were the Priesthood or Canaan such Temporary Things, as Mr. Collins dreams; for the Priesthood is Eternal in Christ, of whom the *Arōnical* Priesthood was a Type, and Canaan a Type of an Eternal Inheritance, as both Learned Ainsworth on Gen. 17. 7. and the Apostle in the Epistle to the Hebrews will tell him.

Arg. 4. It must needs be the Covenant of Grace, if it be the same in substance with that Gen. 3. 15. but it is the same in substance; for the substance of that Promise, Gen. 3. 15. is, *That the seed of the woman (which is Christ) should destroy satan, and open a way to Heaven for lost sinners by Jesus Christ.* Now this Promise, *I will be a God to thee,* &c. is the same in other words; it contains (saith Learned Pool) all manner of Blessings, Temporal, Spiritual, and Eternal, such as Justification, Sanctification, Glorification, as Lev. 26. 12, Psal. 33. 12. Psal. 144. 15. Jer. 31. 33. For though Canaan and Temporal Things were promised,

yet these were Shadows of better Things, and so Abraham understood them, *Heb. 11. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. Gal. 3. 18.*

Arg. 5. If this Covenant, *Gen. 17. 7.* be the same in substance, or rather a clearer Draught of that Promise, *Gen. 12. 3. In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed,* then it is the Covenant of Grace; for Mr. Collins confesseth that is the Covenant of Grace. But this is the same, or rather a clearer Draught; therefore, &c. *In thee, i. e. in thy Seed,* which is Christ, *Gal. 3. 9, 16.* All Nations here must be restrained to those in all Nations that God takes into Covenant, *i. e. Parents believing and their Infants;* so *Gen. 17. 7.* the Promise is more full: *I will bless thee, and thy seed, with all manner of blessings,* (as before) *I will be a God to thee, &c.* How comes this to pass, but through Christ the promised Seed?

Arg. 6. If this Promise, *Gen. 17. 7.* contains in it all manner of Gospel-blessings, such as Pardon, Justification, Sanctification, and Eternal Life, then it is the Covenant of Grace; but it does contain in it all manner of Gospel-blessing, as hath been proved; and as Mr. Tombs (the most considerable Man that ever the Anabaptists had amongst them) confesseth; for in his *Apology, pag. 131.* he thus speaks, *The Covenant (saith he) with Abraham, I find, Gen. 17. 7. and the urging of this Covenant I deny not, Exod. 32. 13. and Deut. 9. 27, 28, 29. Lev. 26. 42. Exod. 3. 6. (all Branches of the Covenant of Grace): And though I say not it contains only the Promise of Canaan, but grant it contains also the Promise of Redemption by Christ, Luke 1. 71, 72.* A very good Argument to prove it the Covenant; for no other Covenant but the Covenant of Grace, contains Redemption and Salvation by Christ.

Arg. 7. It must needs be a Covenant of Grace; for both Circumcision, the Sign and Seal of it, as also, all those other Shadows and Typical-Rites, *viz. the Temple, Priests, Sacrifices, &c.* were Gospel-Ordinances, shadowing out the Way of Salvation, not by the Covenant of Works, but by Christ, as hath been abundantly proved from *Rom. 4. 11. Heb. 9. and 10. 1.* For the Gospel and the Law of Moses are not distinguished as the one being the Covenant of Works, and the other of Grace; but the

the Gospel doth more clearly unfold that way of Salvation that the Law revealed more darkly.

Arg. 8. If that Promise, *Acts. 2. 39.* *The promise is to you, and to your children, and to them that are afar off, &c.* be no other Promise than *Gen. 17. 7.* then it will evidently appear to be the Covenant of Grace; but that Promise, *Acts 2. 39.* is that great Promise, *Gen. 17. 7.* as shall be made evident (by Gods help) in the following Chapter.

C H A P. III.

Proving, That that Promise, Acts 2. 39. (The promise is to you, and to your children, &c.) is the Promise of God to Abraham: Which therefore contains a plain Precept for the baptizing of Infants, containing an Answer to all Mr. Collins hath said to pervert those Words to a contrary Sense.

THat Promise, *Acts 2. 39.* lyeth so full against the *Anabaptists*, that it extreemly justles them; and therefore several leading Men of that Perswasion have put to their help to remove it out of the way: And tho' their Expositions of it have been not only contrary to the Analogy of Faith, but right Reason; yet they have made a great Noise, and rais'd a great Dust, to blind and divert an unwary Reader; neither has Mr. Collins been more happy than the rest of his Brethren in handling that Text. Whither he would have the Promise refer'd, is yet to me unknown; most of them refer it to *v. 17.* the Promise of Miraculous Gifts, spoken of by *Joel*; but this would signifie little to these Persons pricked at the Heart; nothing in the World but Pardon of Sin, and an Interest in the Attoning Blood of the Messiah, could do them any good; they might have these Miraculous Gifts, and be damn'd; neither were these to be continued in the Church, &c. — *be baptized every one of you, &c.* — *for the promise is to you, and to your children, &c.*

The occasion of these Words was that deep Wound made in the Hearts of a Multitude of *Jews*, who had many of them been the Betrayers and Murderers of Christ; they verily thought Christ had been a Seducer; but being now convinced, that He was the Son of God, the Anointed Saviour, they being pricked at the Heart, cry out, *Men and brethren, what shall we do?* The Apostle persuades them to repent of their Sin in Crucifying Christ, and to be Baptized every one of them, and as an Argument to encourage them to it, tells them, That *the promise is to you, and your children, &c. q. d.* Despair not of Pardon and Grace, though your Sin has been so great, for that great Promise, *Gen. 17. 7.* That *God will be your God, and the God of your seed,* is yet to you and your children.

Now I shall particularly open the Text, and shew you,

I. That this Promise is that great Promise, *Gen. 17. 7.*

II. That the Children here spoken of, are the same with Seed there.

I. That that Promise, *Acts 2. 39.* is that Promise, *Gen. 17. 7.*

This I shall prove by these Arguments.

Arg. 1. The Promise here spoken of, must needs be the Promise of Pardon, Justification, and Eternal Life; no other Promise could do them any good, nor any wise answer their Case. It was the wrath of God they feared, the Damnation of Hell they trembled at; nothing but a Christ and Pardon could ease them: but this was nowhere to be found but in the Covenant of Grace; which Covenant is *Gen. 17. 7.* as has been proved.

2. The Apostle here saith, *The promise is to you*, without naming the words of the Promise; so that it must needs be some Remarkable Promise, that the *Jews* very well knew, and were familiarly acquainted with; and what Promise could that be, but the great Promise made by God to their Father *Abraham*, That he would be his God, and the God of his Seed? This they well knew, and gloried in, *John 8. 39*, and the Apostle so readily allows them, *Rom. 9. 4.* And there is an Article in the *Greek Text*, that doth as with the Finger, point them to some great Remarkable Promise, ἡ ἐπαγγελία, which the Learned

Learned *Montanus* renders *repromissio*, a promising again, a repeating a Promise over again; so that prepositive Article *η* doth point to some former Promise, not now mentioned, but which the *Jews* were supposed to be well acquainted with; which must needs be that grand Promise of the Covenant, *Gen. 17. 7.*

3. That Promise the Apostle here speaks of, must be that Promise to which Circumcision was the Seal under the former Dispensation; for the Apostle was speaking to Circumcised *Jews*, who had been taken into Covenant, and had received Circumcision as the Seal, and were still under that Dispensation; for though they were become faulty Members, by Acting ignorantly against Christ, yet they were not discovenanted, but were visible Church-members, though faulty. If any affirm they were discovenanted, let them prove it. Now what Covenant was most proper to be urged to them, but that Covenant which they had all Subscribed to by receiving Circumcision the Seal of it. And this renders the Apostles Discourse very intelligent, *q. d.* Repent of your Crucifying the Lord of Glory, and be Baptized every one of you, &c. for that great Promise of God to *Abraham* and his Seed, *Gen. 17. 7.* and into which Covenant you have been entred by Circumcision, is to you and to your Children in present Possession, and to them which are afar off, whom the Lord our God shall call, when they repent and believe, then the Promise shall be to them and their Children, as it is now to you and yours.

4. This Promise the Apostle speaks of, was that Promise or Covenant of which Baptism was the Seal under the last and most bright Dispensation of the Covenant. This I think needs no further Proof then to read *v. 38, 39.* Remission of Sin was the Substance of that Covenant, and Baptism a Seal of it: Now Circumcision and Baptism are the successive Seals of the Covenant of Grace. The Covenant was the same, though the manner of Administration differ.

II. Who are we to understand by the Children in the Text? No doubt but they are the very same which in *Gen. 17. 7.* are called Seed; the word is *τέκνους*, used for little sucking Babes, *Mat. 21. 18.* and *1 Cor. 7. 14.* This must needs be so, because this being a repetition of

that grand Promise, *Gen. 17. 7.* what are here called Children, must be the same there called Seed, Seed and Children being Synonymous Phrases. This is further evident, if we consider, that under that Dispensation little Infants were at Eight Days old taken into Covenant. That Covenant stands firm, being an Everlasting Covenant; though the Seal has been altered from Circumcision to Baptism, yet the Covenant it self is the same; such as were Church-members then, are so still. So that by Children are here meant Babes, such as from *Abraham's* Time used to be Circumcised.

Object. But doth not the New Testament say, None but Actual Believers are to be baptized?

1. I have proved that the Infants of such Parents as actually believe, ought to be baptized.

2. I Answer in the Words of Learned *Bastingius*; Saith he for the Sophistry of the *Anabaptists*, concluding out of these words, *Mat. 16. 16.* That *he that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved.* Only Believers, not Infants, (say they) are to be baptized, (which speaks only of the Adult.) They may as well cavil, That he that doth not work, must not eat, *2 Thess. 3. 10.* Infants cannot work, therefore they must not eat. The Argument is as good from the one, as the other.

Again, If they will stand so precisely upon the Order of Words, we may plead *Mat. 28. 19.* That Baptizing is set before Teaching: Baptize, teaching them to observe all things. In the Adult, Actual Faith is required; but in Infants, only that they are the Seed of Believers. In the Words, observe,

1. A double Duty commanded, *Repent and be baptized.*

Object. Infants cannot repent; therefore Infants cannot be baptized.

Answer. 1. Infants are included in their Parents. *Adam's* Sin has brought Infants into a state of Sin and Wrath; and the Repentance and Faith of Parents, brings Infants into a Covenant-relation to God.

2. The Command *Repent* extends only to capable Subjects, i. e. to the Parents; but the Command to be *Baptized*, extends to all Fathers and Children, *1 Cor. 7. 14.* as is evident

2. By the Motive or Argument the Apostle uses, —for the

the promise is to you, and your children. For (saith the
aforesaid Learned Bastingius) the Apostles having commanded
every one of them to be baptized, he fetches the Reason not
from their Repentance, or from their Age, but from the
Promise of God made not only to them that are at Years of
Discretion, but Infants. For he had proved before, That
that Promise Peter said was to them, and their children,
was the great Promise, Gen. 17. 7.

But for the better understanding of the Words, con-
sider these Four Things.

1. It is not said, *The promise shall be to you, and your children* ; but it is spoken in the Present Tense, *The promise is to you ; the promise is to your children*. If the Promise had been to their Children upon Actual believing, it had been but the proffer of a Promise ; but ~~the promise is~~ — The Promise was made to Abraham ; they were Abraham's Seed ; and though they were become faulty, yet the Promise was not annulled, but should be ratified to them, upon their owning the Messiah : It was a Promise, in which both them and their Children had a present Actual Right.

2. Consider Repentance here is not a Condition of the Promise, but the Promise a Motive and Argument to Repentance ; Repent, &c. *for the promise is to you, &c.*

3. Consider that though the Promise is said to be to *them and their children, and to them afar off, &c.* yet in a very different manner ; for the Promise to them and their Children, was what they had a present Right to. The Promise was to them, *quoad homines* ; they were under the present Administration of the Covenant : But to those afar off, the Promise was to them only *quoad Deum*, in respect of Gods Purpose, That when the *Gentiles* did believe, then they and their Children should also be brought under the present Administration. These were actually in Covenant, the other decretally only.

4. Consider that as the Promise was at present to these *Jews* and their Children, their Infants being together with their Parents in Covenant ; so likewise the Promise was to the *Gentiles*, those afar off, that when they were called, and did believe them, the Promise would be to them and their Children, as now it was to these and their Children. This is evident, because there never was

any change in the Substance of the Covenant; but Infants being Church-members under every Dispensation, they must be so still; for when God altered the Seals, changed Circumcision into Baptism, and the Passover into the Lords-Supper, he did no ways alter the Covenant, but such as were Church-members before under the former Dispensations are Church-members still under the latter Dispensation. Now that Infants were Church-members under every Dispensation, Mr. Richard Baxter in his Book written against *Tombs* and *Danvers*, has clearly demonstrated, pag. 74, 75, &c.

1. He proves, That in the first Constitution of the Sacred Republick of the World, (which Republick being Sacred and Devoted to Gods Worship, was a Church whereof God was Head) that God gave to Man, in that innocent State, a Covenant of Life, commonly called a Covenant of Works: And had he continued in that innocent Estate, he and his innocent Infant offspring were to have been Church-members of that Church whereof God was Head, I think none will deny. So that under that first Covenant Infants were, or were to have been, Church-members *de jure*; as is evident, *Gen. 1. 26, 27, 28.*

Here you see by the Law of Nature Infants were to have been born in Gods Image, and to have been Church-members: That the first Blessing God promised, or pronounced on Mankind, was, That they propagate Children to be as their Parents in Gods Image.

2. The next Institution of Church-membership, was at the first Promulgation of the Gospel, when Man by Sin had unchurched both himself and Children by breaking the First Covenant. God institutes a New Covenant, gives a Promise of Redemption by Christ, *Gen. 3. 15.* And if God would ever have excluded Infants out of the Visible Church, it would have been now, Infants being fallen from God into a State of Sin, and being utterly incapable to understand the Tenure of the New Covenant; they could not personally consent, or perform any Conditions required: There was Faith and Repentance required in this Covenant, and they were then as incapable to perform them as ever; yet it is certain, Infants were now taken in, together with their Parents, to be visible Church-members.

1. It is certain that this Promise, *Gen. 3. 15.* was the First and Original Draught of the Covenant of Grace, giving some Glimpses of the Way of Salvation by Christ, and therefore virtually contains all that was in After-discovery more clearly expressed.

2. 'Tis as certain that the Seed of the Woman, and the Seed of the Serpent, are not only Christ and Satan, (though Christ is eminently and principally the Womans Seed) but the Godly and the Wicked, *i. e.* the Wicked are the Devil's Seed, or Children, *John 4. 44. 1 John 3. 8.* and the Godly are Christ's Seed, *Psal. 22. 30. Isa. 53. 10.*

3. It is also certain, That these Two Seeds comprehend all the World : Every Man, Woman, and Infant, belongs either to the Seed of the Serpent, or the Seed of the Woman. Those Infants that are excluded from being the Womans Seed, are excluded Salvation. Infants were now Church-members, and so they continued till *Abraham's* Time, *Gen. 12. 3. and Gen. 17. 7.* And this is the

3. Constitution of Infant Church-membership : God comes to renew the Covenant of Grace with *Abraham*, and gives him a clearer Draught of it than the Church had yet had. Now in this Covenant, *Gen. 17. 7.* Infants were comprehended, as hath been abundantly shewed. And the Infants stood in the possession of their Right till Christs Time, which was a

4. Institution of Infant Church - membership ; or rather, a New Declaration, That Infants were continued in Church-membership. Now 'tis evident, That under the Gospel Infants were continued Church-members :

1. Because in all the New Testament we find not one word of the Repeal of their Church-membership. We find the Law, and whatever God would have removed, expressly mentioned ; but not one word, That Infants should no longer be continued Church-members ; which to be sure we should have had particular notice of, had God thrown them out. Let them shew us where Infant Church-membership is Repealed.

2. But we have Assurances from many Passages in the New Testament, That Infants are continued Church-members under the Gospel : As,

1. From Christs Commission, *Mat. 28. 19.* 'The Anabaptists

Anabaptists from hence urge, That none are to be Baptized but such as are first Taught; but this is their Mistake. The Command is, *Μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, Go disciple me all nations, teaching them. Infants are a great part of Nations. When the Parents being taught, believe, they are disciplined and their Infants with them.

2. We have clear Notice, It has been the manner under every Dispensation to take in Infants with their Parents, as we have proved. It was so under the Law, *Exod. 12. 48.* If a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it; and he shall be as one that was born in the land. And thus it was in the Apostles Days, when the Master or Head of a Family was converted and baptized, his whole Family was baptized with him; as in *Cornelius, Acts 10.* and *Lydia and the Jaylour, Acts 16.* and the Household of *Stephanus, 1 Cor. 1. 16.* and the Household of *Crispus, Acts 18. 8.* This was done in Conformity to the perpetual Custom of the Church under every Dispensation, to take in Families together.

3. It is evident also by what Christ saith, *Mar. 10. 13.* *Luke 18. 15.* and *Mat. 19. 14.* where Christ commands little Children to be brought to him, and saith, *They do belong to the Kingdom of Heaven.* Where Christ owns them as Church-members; for to none other doth the Kingdom of Heaven belong in a known way.

Now to return to *Acts 2. 39.* The promise is to you, and to your children. I will conclude in the Words of Holy Mr. *Rutherford*, Break (saith he) the Text into an hundred pieces, and blood it as Men please, this is the genuine Thesis which cannot be neglected, viz. That those to whom the Promise of the Covenant belongs, those should be baptized. But the Promise of the Covenant is to you, and your children; therefore you, and your Children, ought to be baptized. Or if this displease, we will stand by Mr. *Stephens* his Syllogistical Frame upon the Text, viz. That they who have a Right to be baptized by the Word of Promise, they also have a Right to be baptized by the Word of Command. But the Infants of believing Parents have a Right to be baptized by the Word of Promise; therefore they have a Right by the Word of Command, Be baptized every one

one of you ; Then the Word of Command, For the promise is to you, and your children. There the Word of Promise, the Command and Promise, are mutual.

And so I have here Answered the Desires of our *Anabaptist* Brethren : Give us (say they) a Word of Command in the New Testament, and we will believe. Here is both a Word of Command and a Word of Promise. Let us now see whether a Word of Command, or Promise either, will gain them.

And thus I have proved Infant-baptism Gods Ordinance. Let me as a Close to this Chapter, add, That the *Anabaptists* are very angry with me, for charging them with false Doctrine : And what I said before, I say again, viz.

1. That Doctrine that makes all Infants to be of the Visible Kingdom of Satan, is false Doctrine. But to deny Infant-baptism, is to deny them to be of the Visible Church, or Kingdom of Christ : And if they are not in the Church, they are out of it, and of the visible Kingdom of the Devil.

2. That Doctrine that leaves us no well grounded hope of the Salvation of any Infant dying in its Infancy, is false Doctrine. But the *Anabaptists* in denying Baptism to Infants, deny all well grounded Hope of their Salvation ; for if they have no Right to Baptism, they have no Right to Salvation. See more of this in my former Book, pag. 34, 35.

Mr. *Collins* pretends to Answer ; but his Answer is nothing but a meer Blind. Let him, or any of them, prove the contrary, and shew us that any Person out of the Church and Kingdom of Christ, is not visibly in the Kingdom of Satan : Or what Scripture-right we have to expect the Salvation of any Person not added, or that has not a Right to be added to the Visible Church.

C H A P. IV.

Shewing the Right Manner how Baptism ought to be Administred, is not by Dipping the Whole Body under Water, but by Pouring, Sprinkling, or otherwise applying Water to the Person Baptized, demonstrated in variety of Scripture Arguments.

WE are now come to examine which is the Right Manner of Administring this Sacrament of Baptism. The *Anabaptists* confidently Affirm, The Right Manner is Dipping the whole Body under Water : And (say they) if not so performed, is no Baptism at all.

Now for Dipping in Baptism they plead,

1. That the *Greek* word signifies to Dip.
2. That the Manner of Baptizing in the Primitive Times was by Dipping.
3. *John's* baptizing at *Enon*.
4. The word *burial* being *buried* in *Baptism*.

And let the prudent Reader in general note, That if it were proved that Dipping was ever used in Baptizing in the Primitive Times, yet would it do their Cause no Service, Dipping being but a Circumstance, and no ways Essential to the Ordinance, those Countries being Hot ; whereas in these Cold Climates, dipping in Cold Water is injurious to Health and Life : We should be no more obliged to imitate it, than to Eat the Lords-Supper in the Evening in an Inn, and upper Room, &c. But there is no clear Evidence that ever any were Dipt, much less that all were. Where was the Jailor Dipt, or those Baptized at *Jerusalem* ? There was no River near, but only some Springs and Fountains, which the Inhabitants would never suffer Multitudes of Men and Women to be Dipt in them. But we will examine fairly by Scripture these Four Considerations that they plead for Dipping.

I. They say, *The word Baptizing in Greek signifieth to be Dipped* : They say, *To Baptize in English is to Dip*. And so there is the *English* of *English*. I always look on the word [*Baptise*] to be *English* ; but with them, there is
other

other *English* for it. Well, but let us enquire what these Words *Βαπτίζω*, *Βαπτισμός*, *Βάπτισμα*, signifie in the Original Language. *Βαπτίζω* comes indeed from *Βάπτω*, to Dip or Plunge; but it is seldom, or never, used for Dipping in the New Testament. It signifies to Pour, Wash, or Sprinkle. Though it be derived of a Word that signifies to Dip, it does not follow it signifies so.

1. If the Word *Baptizo* signifies always (or for the most part) in the New Testament to wash, pour out, or sprinkle, and seldom, or never, to Dip; then Dipping is not the Right Mode of Baptizing. But the Word *Baptizo* is never rendred to Dip in all the New Testament. I have observed that *Baptizo*, *Baptismos*, *Baptisma*, are used about 70 times in the New Testament, and are mostly by our Translators rendred *Baptism*, or to Baptize, and some 5 or 6 times 'tis Translated *Washing*, and in 1 Cor. 10. 2. it signifies to Baptize by sprinkling; for all the World knows a Cloud doth but sprinkle.

Now if our Learned Translators had known that *Baptizo* signified to Dip, or the true *English* of it is *Dipping*, (as the *Anabaptists* pretend) sure they would somewhere or other have so rendred it: And the Learned Criticks in the *Greek*, as *Stephanus*, *Pasor*, *Vossius*, *Schrevelius*, *Simpson*, and, *instar omnia*, Learned *Leigh* in his *Critica Sacra* tells us, that it signifies generally any *Washing* and *Sacramental Sprinkling*. And it is not yet proved, That it ever signifies *Dipping* in all the New Testament. To *Wash* and *Sprinkle* then is a known Sence, but *Dipping* over Head uncertain. Is it not then safer for us to follow the certain known, than a disputed uncertain Sence of the Word?

2. If the Threefold Baptism, viz. of Water, of the Spirit, and of Afflictions, be but one Baptism, and expressed by one Word in the Original, then the true sence and meaning of the Word *Baptizo*, which in the Original signifies both the Baptism of Water, of the Spirit, and of Afflictions, must have the same signification in one as in another. So that if it signifies to Dip in one, it must signifie to Dip in all: And if in one kind of Baptism it cannot signifie *Dipping*, neither can it be so taken in another. Now the Three kinds of Baptism, viz. of Water, *Acts* 10. 47. of the Spirit, *Mat.* 3. 11. and of Afflictions,

Afflictions, *Mark* 10. 39. Now these Three are but one, and expressed by one and the same Word, *Ephes.* 4. 5. viz. *ἡ βάπτισμα*, one Baptism. Now then the way of Administration in these Three several kinds of Baptism, must be the same. Now if the Word signifie *washing*, *pouring*, or *sprinkling* in one kind of Baptism, it must signifie so in another.

Now 'tis certain that the Word *Baptizo* doth signifie *Sprinkling*, or to *Baptize by sprinkling*, *1 Cor.* 10. 2. *They were all* (Infants as well as grown Persons) *baptized by the Cloud*. A Cloud doth but sprinkle, or pour out Water, not Dip, *Psal.* 77: 17, 18, 19, 20. where the *Psalmist* is speaking of *Israel* marching through the Sea; and this is what *St. Paul* would have us by no means to be ignorant of, *ver.* 1. as containing something very instructive to the Churches of Christ; and what is it but the Manner how the *Jews* were baptized by, or in, the Cloud in the Sea? And Learned *Ainsworth* out of the Hebrew Doctors tells us, That Baptism was no New Thing to the *Jews* in the Apostles Days, but had been long practised in the *Jewish Church*; (it may be ever since *Moses's* Time, when they were thus baptized by the Cloud) that every Male was Circumcised, Baptized, and brought an Offering. Yea, the *Magdeburgenses* tell us, *Cent.* 1. *lib.* 1. *cap.* 4. *pag.* 152. That Baptism was taken from the *Jewish Custom* of Washing, and that Infant-baptism was in use among the *Jews*, together with Circumcision, for a Rite of Initiation both for the Natural *Jews*, and Strangers profelyted at Age: The same, *Goodwin* and *Selden*, the great Antiquaries; as also *Dr. Hammond* does make appear. This shews Baptism to be of great Antiquity, and helps to take off the Wonder, Why the *Jews*, who were ready to quarrel at every thing Christ and the Disciples did, yet never question them for introducing a New Rite into the Worship of God; which had it never been known before, they would certainly have done.

Now *St. Paul* (who had the Mind of Christ, *1 Cor.* 2. 16. and was as Learned in the *Greek Tongue* as any Criticks since his Time) tells us in effect, They were baptized by Sprinkling, or pouring out Water: And so the Holy Ghost determines the right meaning of the word *Baptizo*. So then in Water-baptism, 'tis evident the word

word *Baptizo* signifies to baptize by *Sprinkling*, or *Pouring*. So in the Spiritual Baptism, 'tis expressed by the same Greek word that the Anabaptists will have alwayes to signifie Dipping, Acts 1. 5. *For John truly baptized* (Note, not in water, as if he had Dipped them, but) *with water*, as being otherwise applyed, ἐκδύσας ὕδατι: This was Water-baptism; but then follows the Spiritual Baptism, ὑμεῖς ὅ βαπτισθήσεσθε ἐν πνεύματι, you shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost. And how was this, by being dipped or plunged in the Spirit, but by having the Holy Ghost sprinkled or poured out on them after the manner of Rain? as Joel 2. 28. *I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh.* Isa. 32. 15. *Until the Spirit be poured out.* Zech. 12. 10. *I will pour out the Spirit of Grace.* And very oft in Scripture is this Spiritual Baptism expressed by Sprinkling, as Isa. 52. 15. *So shall he sprinkle many nations.* And Ezek. 36. 25. *He shall pour or sprinkle clean water upon you.* Heb. 10. 22. *Our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience.* And a multitude of other Places, where the giving of the Spirit, &c. is expressed by sprinkling. Thus you see it evident, in Spiritual Baptism also, that the word *Baptizo* signifies to pour out or sprinkle, and not to dip. And then as to the Baptism of Afflictions (which *Manasseh King*, an Anabaptist in *Coventry*, saith, the Devil is the Administrator) 'tis true, some suffer more, some less; some suffer lighter Crosses, as Mocks, &c. some Loss of Goods and Liberty; others Death. Now he that suffers least for Christ in a Christian manner, doth as truly partake of the Baptism of Afflictions as he that suffers most. So in Water-baptism, the quantity of Water is not material; he that hath but a few Drops applyed, is as really baptized as he that is Dipped. Hence their First Plea is sufficiently Answered, from the meaning of the word *Baptism*.

II. Their Second Head of Argument for Dipping is fetched from what they fancy to be the Mode of baptizing in the Primitive Times, viz. *John's* baptizing in *Jordan*, and *Christ's* coming up out of the Water, and *Philip* and the Eunuch's going down into, and coming up out of the Water, Mat. 3. 6, 13, 14, 15, 16. and Mark 1. 9, 10. Acts 8. 38, 39. But no clear convincing Proof can be fetched hence, to prove that ever any were dipt in those Times: For,

1. They

1. They might go down into the Water, and come up out of the Water, and yet not be Dipt in it : They might go to the Brink of *Jordan*, or into the Edge of the River, and the Administrator might with his Hand, or otherwise, flash water in their Faces, and yet no Dipping. And this is most likely ; and I am informed, that this is the way that many *Anabaptists* use in *Holland* and *Germany* at this Day ; nay, one of them told me, it's used by some of them in *England*.

2. The *Greek* Texts, which are truly the Scriptures, (and no Translation is so any further than it agrees with the Original) do not necessarily signifie going into the Water, *Mat. 3. 16.* ὑπο τῆς ὕδατος, out of the water (as there rendred) is in plain *English* no more than from the water ; and so Learned *Mintanus* renders it, *de aquâ*, from the water. That *Mark 1. 10.* is the same. Learned *Leigh* tells us, it signifies *A, vel Ab, From* ; and it were easie to produce Hundreds of Examples in the New Testament, that ὑπο signifies generally no more than from, *Mat. 1. 17.* ὑπο Ἀβραάμ from Abraham, ὑπο Δαβὶδ, from David : And so from the carrying away to *Babylon* : So *Mat. 7. 20.* By (i. e. from) their fruits you shall know them. *Mat. 24. 21.* [From] the beginning. *Mark 15. 38.* In all which (and a multitude of other places) ὑπο signifies From. And let them shew that can why it ought not to be so rendred in our Saviours Baptism : And then for *Acts 8. 38.* They went both εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ unto the water : For the *Greek* Preposition εἰς signifies unto, as 'tis rendred in other places, *Mat. 15. 24.* I am not sent, but [εἰς] unto the lost sheep. And *Mat. 26. 10.* She hath wrought a good work εἰς ἐμέ upon me, i. e. erga me, to me. *John 6. 9.* What are they [εἰς] among (or unto) so many. *John 13. 1.* εἰς τέλος, unto the end. By these few Examples among many, it is evident, That into and out of the Water, is no more than unto and from the Water. And yet this will further appear, *Acts 8. 38.* where it is ἐκ τῆς ὕδατος ; where though 'tis not ὑπο but ἐκ, yet signifies the same thing, (i. e.) from. as *Mat. 16. 1.* ἐκ τῆς οὐρανό, a sign from heaven. *Mark 16. 3.* ἐκ τῆς θύρας, from the door. *Mat. 19. 20.* ἐκ νεότητός μου, from my youth. So that from our *English* Translation nothing can be concluded for Dipping.

3. But

3. But suppose the words were rightly Translated, and signifie going into, and coming up out of the water, yet if this Phrase into, and out of the water, in the usual Language of Scripture, doth not signifie into, or out of the water, but only into the place, and out of the place, where the water hath sometime been, then still nothing can be hence concluded for Dipping. Now 'tis certain, that in *Jordan*, in the *Sea*, &c. in the usage of Scripture, doth not necessarily signifie over Head in water, but only in the place where the water sometimes was, as is evident from 1 Cor. 10. 2. The Apostle tells us, they were all baptized in the sea: And yet this was not in the water of the Sea; but when they were baptized, they stood on dry Ground, *Exod. 14. 20, 29.* So in *Jordan*, 'tis said, *Josh. 3. 14.* that the Priest stood in the midst of *Jordan*; but not in the water of *Jordan*, but on dry Ground. Thus *John* baptized in *Jordan*, not standing in the water, (for any thing we can gather from Scripture) but by the brink of the water where *Jordan* had sometimes run; for it sometimes over-flowed all its banks. So *John*. Yea, *Christ*, yea, *Philip* and the Eunuch went down into, and came up out of the water, as the *Jews* went down into the Sea, and came up out of the Sea, or as the Priests went down into, and came up out of *Jordan*, *Josh. 3. 17.* So that from hence still can no Argument be brought for Dipping.

III. The *Anabaptists* argue from *John's* baptizing at *Enon*, *John 3. 23.* because ('tis said) there was much water there. Hence they infer, *John* must needs baptize by Dipping: And *Mr. Collins* saith, I have contradicted the Scripture, in saying, there was not much water there. Let's examine the Text. What the Scripture saith is true: What I said is true; and no contradiction will be found, upon an impartial Enquiry. Learned *Piscator* saith, ὁδὸν πολλὰ videntur significare plures rivus, non unum flumen magnum: That the words signifie many waters, not one great River: And so the *Vulgar Latin* (commonly called *St. Jerom's*) renders it, *aque multe erant illic*; which *Hollybush Englishes*, many waters, that is, several small Rills of water, springing out of several little Holes or Eyes: For the word *Enon* was the Name of a Town, so called from some Fountains of water springing there;

and *Enon* comes from the Hebrew word עֵינַי, a Fountain; which word also signifies an Eye; so it must signify a little Fountain, a Fountain sending forth but little water, in conformity to the Eye: So Mr. Simpson saith, *Alay* in Hebrew is עֵינַי, a little Fountain. From whence we may gather, that at *Enon* were several of these little Springs. So that though there really was but little Waters, (as Travellers have told us, a Man might stop it with the Foot) yet

1. There was much, that is, many waters; several little Holes, like Eyes, gushing out water.

2. There was much water comparatively, as a Bucketful is much compared with a Spoonful. *Judea* was a dry Hot Countrey: The *Anabaptists* mistake to think it was filled with Springs and Rivers, as *England* is; but in the Southern Part there was more water than in other Parts. So here was comparatively much, and yet really but a little water; not enough for any thing can be proved to Dip in. So from hence it cannot be proved, That any were Dipped when baptized.

IV. Their last Head of Argument for Dipping is from Col. 2. 12. compared with Rom. 6. *buried with Christ in baptism.* They say, this refers to the Custom of baptizing; but first let them prove the Custom. This doth not prove the Custom. Now, saith Mr. Wall, (to follow the natural Fancy of the *Anabaptists* in this Thing) *Then we must be baptized as Christ was buried, or as the manner of the Jews was to bury.* Then the Person baptized must be wholly passive, must not put a Foot into the water, but the Administrator must take up the Person, lay him upon the water, and there let him sink, and continue so long under water as Christ lay in the Grave; or if it be but while the words of Institution are repeating, viz. *I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;* in which time, in all probability, the Person will be drowned. And though the *Anabaptists* plead for this Practice, yet they hypocritically practice the contrary; the Person to be baptized putting himself into the water to the Knees, or Middle, and then he that baptizeth dippeth but the upper Parts: And that is the same thing that we do, pouring water on the Face, the most Noble Part, and by which the whole Man is signified,

Gen. 16. 6. Sarah's Face is put for the Person of Sarah, and *Luke 9. 52.* and *10. 1.* Christ's Face is put for the Person of Christ. So that if water be poured on the Face in Baptism, it's as much as if the whole body were under water: For either to baptize the Face, is the baptizing the whole Person, or else if the whole Person must be dipt, it must be naked when dipt; for that part of the Body that is baptized must be naked, as is evident from all the Legal Washings under the Law, *Exod. 40. 31, 32.* and under the Gospel also. See *Luke 7. 38. John 13. 5. Ezek. 16. 9. Acts 22. 16. Tit. 3. 5.* That Part that is not bare when baptized, cannot be said to be baptized, but rather the Covering. But now a pouring water upon the Face, which represents the Person, is rightly to baptize the Person.

The Apostles design in *Col. 2. 12.* and *Rom. 6.* is not to prove the Mode of Baptism, but the End or Thing signified thereby, *viz.* the Death of Sin, and a new Resurrection to a Life of Grace and Holiness, engagement to put off the old Man, and put on Christ; which pouring water on the Face does as aptly represent, yea more, the way of our Spiritual cleansing by the Blood of Christ. So that this concludes nothing for Dipping.

Now farther to prove that Dipping is no wayes necessary in baptizing, take these following Arguments.

Arg. 1. That which Christ the Ordainer of Baptism no where requires, can be no Ordinance of God. But Christ no where requires Dipping; Therefore Dipping is not necessary.

Arg. 2. If the thing signified by Baptism is sufficiently exprest without Dipping, then Dipping is not necessary. But the thing signified in Baptism is aptly and fully exprest by Pouring or Sprinkling. The Sign need not exceed the thing signified; now the thing signified is Regeneration and cleansing the Soul from the Guilt and stain of Sin. This is aptly represented by Pouring or Sprinkling, as is evident, *Ezek. 36. 25. Zech. 12. 10. Heb. 9. 1 Pet. 1. 1, 2. and 3. 21.*

Arg. 3. All Sacraments ought to be administered without just scandal; but Dipping cannot: *Ergo.*

Arg. 4. Christ's Ordinances are calculated for all that believe in every place: But all cannot use Dipping; for some

some Countries are so hot and dry, there is no Water to dip multitudes in ; others are so cold, dipping cannot be used without danger of Life. Therefore Dipping is not necessary.

Arg. 5. Baptism takes place immediately upon believing. Suppose a Woman in Child-bed is then converted, must she come next way out of her bed, and be dipt. This is to suppose Christ a harder Master than *Moses*. I lately heard of a Woman that was so dipt, and died.

Thus Dipping is not Gods Ordinance.

To conclude : What shall we say to the *Anabaptists* that dip and rebaptize themselves? The first *Anabaptists* in *Germany* did so, and one *Smith* an *Englishman*, that was a Member of Mr. *Ainsworth* Congregation, did so ; because they had none to do it for them, there being no *Anabaptists* before them. Is this warrantable for any Man to baptize himself? I think we have great reason to look on such a Baptism to be a meer Nullity. So then the Baptism of the *Anabaptists* is no Baptism at all, having an unlawful Original: 'Tis a Baptism not from Heaven, but of Men. And while they proudly disown Communion with Protestant Churches, as no Churches, and cry down our Ministry and Baptism as nothing, have not we much more cause to disown and question them. Our Baptism and Ministry is from Heaven ; but whence is theirs? from *Stock*, *Matthias*, *Becold*, *Smith*, and a Rabble of blasphemous Men.

C H A P. V.

Proving the Anabaptists to be notoriously unsound in other Points besides that of Baptism ; several of their unsound Heterodox Opinions being laid down and detected, as contrary to the Scripture, and the Doctrine owned in all Protestant Churches.

IF the *Anabaptists* were sound, and Orthodox in all other Points, (Baptism only excepted) and they would differ peaceably in this, we should gladly bear with them ; but

but they have revived several old condemned Heresies, and are extreemly rotten in some Fundamental Truths, as I shall prove. And let them not take it ill, that I charge them thus highly; others before me have done it. Learned Chemnitius saith, *Anabaptista multos prodigiosos errores fovent*, i. e. The Anabaptists have nourished many prodigious Errors. And again, saith he, *Anabaptista renovant errores Donatistarum*, i. e. The Anabaptists have revived the Errors of the Donatists.

1. The Anabaptists are very erroneous in the Doctrine of Original Sin; which is a Fundamental Point. Learned Mr. Polhil saith, 'Tis a momentous Doctrine, the knowledge whereof admirably tends to undeceive and deliver us from that fascinating Opinion of our own Righteousness, and to prepare us to accept of a Cure from Christ. St. Augustine, speaking of Adam and Christ, saith, *In horum duorum hominum causâ proprie fides Christiana consistit*, i. e. The Christian Faith stands in the knowledge of these Two Men: (the one is the Spring of Sin and Death, the other of Grace and Life.) And speaking of the Pelagians, as denying Original Sin, he charges them, *Fundamenta Christiana Fidei evertere*, to overturn the Foundation of the Christian Faith.

And let me here insert a Passage of Mr. Cheinel, sometimes Fellow of Merton Colledge, in his Book against Socinianism, pag. 51. saith he, The Socinians have taught the Anabaptists to deny that Infants are conceived and born in sin. And this is the true reason why they deny them Baptism, though they urge many other Reasons to colour the business. No wonder the Baptism of Infants is neglected by all who deny Original Sin. This Doctrine, That Infants have no Original Sin, the Anabaptists owned at Frankford in their Conference with the Ministers. Thus far Mr. Cheinel.

They have published many Books (or rather Pamphlets) in English, wherein they have owned this Doctrine. Mr. H. Ainsworth, confuting their Opinion about Original Sin, saith, viz. That the Anabaptists hold more erroneously than the very Papists, That Original Sin is an idle Term, and that there is no such thing as Men intend by the Word. And then he lays down their Assertion thus, viz. No Infant can be in a state of Condemnation; for without Sin there is no Condemnation: But without the Transgression of the Law, there is no Sin; Infants have transgressed no Law, therefore Infants have no Sin.

But to come closer to the Anabaptists of our Dayes, sometime since, *Manasseh King*, a Taylor in Coventry, writes a Pamphlet, calling it, *A useful Catechism*, which was scattered about in several Families of my Hearers, with loud Brags of its Excellency and Orthodoxy: So that if I charge *Manasseh King's* Opinion on them as theirs, I do them no wrong, especially since he tells us, he was desired to Print it by an Assembly of Messengers, and Elders; (for they have Three sorts of Officers, Bishops, or Messengers, Elders and Deacons.) Now p. 10. He tells us of Pain, Death, and the joys of a pleasant Paradise; but not a word of Hell, as the fruit of Adam's Sin. And in their *Confession*, Printed 1691. Intituled, *A Brief Confession or Declaration of Faith: Set forth by many of us who are falsely called Anabaptists*. And this *Confession* is Subscribed by *Thos. Monk, Francis Stanly, Edward Stanly, Ben. Morley*, and above 70 more. Now, Art. 2. they tell us, *Man by sin fell into a miserable and mortal Condition: And Art. 10. That all Children dying in Infancy, having not actually transgressed against the Law in their own persons, are only subject to the first Death, which comes upon them by the First Adam, from whence they shall all be rais'd by the Second Adam: And not that any one of them, dying in that estate, shall suffer for Adam's Sin eternal Punishment in Hell, &c.*

Hence it's evident, they plainly deny Original Sin, and say, *All the Evil it brings is only a Temporal Death*. So that none are brought into a state of Condemnation by Adam's Sin; for if no Infants are, then no person in the world; for all are at first Infants: And herein they directly contradict the Apostle, *Rom. 5. 18.* who tells us, *That by the offence of one (i. e. Adam's Sin) judgment came upon all to condemnation*. Now, whom shall we believe, the Anabaptists, or *St. Paul*? I know in their 30 *Articles*, Printed 1679. (and therefore that is of a much older date, and we may rather suppose this their Judgment than that) they say otherwise in shew, speaking as if they did own Original Sin: But by that time they have reconciled the 15th. and 18th. *Articles* in that *Confession* together, it will be all of a piece with this latter *Confession*; for do but devest those 30 *Articles* of those slippery and equivocating Terms (which *Mr. Cheimel* saith the Ana-

baptists

baptists in his Time used) and it will be easie to reconcile them together.

Now that this Fancy of the Anabaptists, That no Infant is in a state of Condemnation (and if not an Infant, then no person in the World) by Original Sin, I shall disprove

1. I will prove that all by Birth or Nature, are by the Sin of Adam lyable to the Condemnation of Hell, by plain Scripture.

2. That they have always been condemned as Hereticks that thus denied Original Sin.

3. That all the Protestant Churches and Confessions in the World, condemn this Error.

1. The Holy Scripture proves all by Birth or Nature lyable to God's Eternal Displeasure for Original Sin. In this estate they are conceived, being wholly dead to God; and in this estate they abide, till regenerated by Grace: Gen. 2. 17. *In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt dye.* This Command and Threatning extended to all Adam's Posterity, and the Death is a Spiritual and Eternal, as well as a Temporal Death, Gen. 3. 1. *Adam was created in the likeness of God; but (v. 3) he begat a Son not in Gods likeness, but his own, i. e. a sinner as he was.* When God created Man, it was *sanctus, sanctum*: A holy God created a holy Creature; but when fallen Adam begets, it was *corruptus, corruptum*: A corrupt Man begets a corrupt thing. And this was said of Seth, in whose Loyns the Church was continued, Gen. 8. 21. *The imagination of mans heart is evil from his youth.* The Hebrew word (*Nagor*) signifies to move, as the Infant in the Womb to the birth; and therefore from his youth, is as much as, *ab eo momento quo fuit in lucem editus*, from the birth. Job 14. 4. *Who can bring a clean thing out of that which is unclean? no not one.* Job 15. 14. *What is man, that he should be clean? and he that is born of a woman, that he should be holy?* Psal. 51. 5. *Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me.* See Isa. 48. 8. Psal. 58. 3. Ezek. 16. 4, 5, 6. John 3. 3, 6. Rom. 5. 12. *all dead, v. 14. Though Infants had not sinned as Adam, yet had they sinned in Adam; Death reigned over them not meerly a corporal Death, but that Death that is directly opposite to Spiritual and Eternal Life,*

v. 18. and to Justification, 16, 17. and v. 18, 19. Nothing can more directly prove, That Death brought on us by Adam, is a Death in Sin, a Death to Condemnation, which is opposed to being made righteous by Justification. 1. If Children need Regeneration, and a Second Birth, before they can go to Heaven, then are they lyable to Eternal as well as Temporal Death. But Children do need Regeneration; therefore, &c. *John* 3. 3, 5.

2. If Infants are not lyable to the Damnation of Hell for Adam's Sin, then they may be saved without Christ, by vertue of the Covenant of Works; but none can be so saved, *Rom.* 3. 19. No Salvation for Infants, or any, but by Christ, *Rom.* 3. 20, 21, 22. *Eph.* 1. 7. *Acts* 4. 12. *Neither is there salvation in any other.*

3. Such as are by Nature Children of Wrath, are lyable to the Condemnation of Hell; but all are so, Therefore Infants, *Eph.* 2. 1, 2, 3.

2. Such as have denied the Doctrine of Original Sin have been accounted Hereticks. *Pelagius* denied Original Sin; *St. Austin* charges him to overturn the Christian Religion, and the Church hath ever since condemned him and others of that Opinion for it.

3. All Protestant Churches in the World condemn this as a very dangerous Error. Do but read the Confessions of the old *Waldenses*, *Albigesnes*; and the Confessions of Protestant Reformed Churches abroad, as the *Catechism* taught in the Schools and Churches of the Low Countries, and the Dominions of the County *Palatine*, with *Bastin- gius* his Exposition, *Quest.* 5. the Articles of *Scotland*, *Geneva*; and indeed, all Foreign Churches. Come we to the Church of *England*, in all her Articles and Confessions: As those Articles agreed on in the Convocation, 1552. in the Reign of *Edward VI.* Art. 9. Original Sin stands not in following of Adam, (as the *Pelagians* do vainly talk) but it is the fault and corruption of the Nature of every Man, naturally engendered of the off-spring of Adam, whereby Man is very far gone from Original Righteousness, and is of his Nature enclined to evil. — And therefore in every person born into the world, it deserves Gods wrath and damnation. So the 23 Article agreed upon by the Arch- bishops, Bishops, and the rest of the Clergy of *Ireland* at *Dublin*, 1615. saith, That Man by Original sin is deprived

of Original Righteousness.— Every one born into the world deserves damnation. This Doctrine is sprinkled almost every where in the Book of Homilies, That we are all dead, Children of wrath, lyable to Gods wrath and Hell, &c.

And the present Articles of the Church of England, that all subscribe to, both Conformists and Nonconformists that qualifie themselves according to Law to Preach; and therefore I wonder how the Anabaptist Preachers, that have in open Court subscribed these Articles of Election, Original sin, Perseverance of the Saints, and the like, how they dare open their mouths against what they have so publickly owned, and subscribed to.

The 9th. Article, Of Original Sin; which is word for word as before recited in the Articles of King Edward the VI. Now the Anabaptists in the Doctrine of Original sin, are more erroneous than the Papists; for they own the Doctrine, That all are by Nature guilty, but fancy Baptism wholly destroys Original sin.

Second Error the Anabaptists are guilty of, is this, That Christ dyed alike for all Men, and that all persons in the World are by the Death of Christ put into a capacity of Salvation. That this is their Opinion, Manasseh King in his Catechism (the 18th. Article) in their Orthodox Creed (falsly so called) and the 2 d. and 3 d. Articles in their fore-mentioned Confession, all of a sort.

But that this is a false and dangerous Doctrine, I shall endeavour to demonstrate. Learned Polhil, Gere, Prin, Burges, Whitfield, besides many others, have so copiously confuted this Errour, that in confuting it, I must necessarily bring out some of their Weapons.

1. I shall give some Arguments to prove Christ did not dye for all alike.

2. Answer some Objections to the contrary.

1. I lay down this Assertion, Christ did dye for all Men in some sence, or all have some benefit by the Death of Christ; for in him we live, and move, and have our being; That the World is continued in being; That the ungodly enjoy any common Mercy, such as Health, Peace; To be one moment out of Hell. The Enjoyment of these Mercies are owing to the Redemption of Christ.

2. But though Christ did dye for all in some sence, yet he did not dye for all alike.

Arg. 1.

Arg. 1. If Christ dyed for all alike, then hath he not purchased Pardon, Reconciliation, and Eternal Life, for any one more than another; but all still stand at an equal distance or nearness to Salvation. This none can deny. But the Holy Scripture assures us, that Christ hath done much more for the Salvation of some than he hath done for others; Therefore this Doctrine is false. This I shall prove.

1. Jesus Christ hath done more to some in affording them the Means of Grace, which he has denied to others, *John 14. 22. Luke 10. 21.* Some at this Day enjoy the bright shining Light of the Gospel, while others sit in darkness.

2. Christ prays for the preservation and salvation of some, but not for all, *John 17. 9. I pray for these: I pray not for the world.* Therefore Christ has done much more for some than others.

3. God has elected some, but he has not elected all, *Eph. 1. 4, 5.*

4. He has a peculiar Love for some, but not such a Love for all, *John 13. 1.*

5. He has drawn some to himself by the Cords of divine Love, but not all, *John 6. 44.*

6. He died for his Sheep, *Joh. 10. 15.* All are not Sheep.

7. He has actually applied the benefits of Redemption to some, but not to all, *1 Cor. 6. 11.* This was of meer Grace, *Eph. 2. 8.*

Arg. 2. If Christ dyed for all alike, there's nothing of meer Free Grace, or Gods distinguishing Love, in the Salvation of one more than another. Gods Grace and Love then was as great to Cain, Pharaoh, Judas, to them that are damned, as to Peter, David, Abraham, or any Saint. This will infallibly and unavoidably follow upon their Doctrine. Now that this is false Doctrine. For 'tis very evident, Jesus Christ has a special Love more for the saved than the damned; and there's much more of the Love and Free Grace of God manifested to some, more than others, *Eph 5. 25.* The Apostle makes Christs special and peculiar Love to belong to the Church only as the Husband is to love his Wife, with a super-eminent Love, so Christ his Church, *Eph. 2. 8. By grace ye are saved.* See the first Argument.

Arg. 3.

Arg. 3. Those for whom Christ dyed, in a special sense, shall never be condemned, nor come into condemnation, *Rom. 8. 34. John 10. 28. John 5. 24.* but now the wicked shall come into condemnation, shall be condemned, and eternally perish. Therefore Christ did not dye for all alike.

Arg. 4. If the Scripture doth restrain the peculiar benefit of Christs Death to some only, then he did not dye for all alike. But the Scripture doth restrain the benefit of Christs Death to some. The Scripture saith, Christ dyed for many, *Mat. 26. 28. Heb. 9. 28. Isa. 53. 12.* He is said to dye for his sheep, *John 10. 13, 15. Heb. 13. 20.* for his people, *Mat. 1. 21. Heb. 2. 17.* for the Sons of God, *John 11. 50, 51, 52.* for his Church, *Acts 20. 28. Eph. 5. 25.* and for the Elect of God, *Rom. 8. 33, 34.* Turn to, and read these Scriptures. Christ dyed for none but the persons here mentioned.

Objections Answered.

Object. 1. Several places say, Christ dyed for all, as *Heb. 2. 9. 1 Tim. 2. 6. 1 Tim. 4. 10. 2 Cor. 5. 14, 15. 1 John 2. 1, 2, 3.*

Ans. 1. I grant Christ dyed for all in some sense, all have some benefit by the Death of Christ; and if any of these Texts are to be taken distributively for every particular Man, it can mean no more than such common benefits to the Non-elected as before mentioned.

2. But the word [*all*] is rather in these places taken collectively, not for every individual person, but for all sorts, estates, and conditions of men, whether high or low, rich or poor, learned or unlearned: For so the word [*all*] is generally taken in Scripture, as *Mat. 9. 35.* Christ is said to heal every sickness and every disease, i. e. every kind of disease, so *Luke 12. 42. Acts 10. 12. Luke 3. 6. Joel 2. 28. Isa. 40. 5.* and we read of all [*all*] going out to John's baptism, *Mat. 3. 5.* when that was perhaps not the 10th. person, and so these Scriptures do not mean every one in the World, but some of all sorts, all given to Christ, all the Elect, all the sons of the Church, sheep of Christ, and the like, *1 John 2. 2.* is not the world of the wicked, but *mundus ex mundo*, the world of Believers only; and *1 Tim. 4. 10.* should rather

rather be translated *preserver*; for so *σωτηρ* there signifies, *Psal.* 145. 15, 16. for God is the Preserver of all.

Object. 2. *The Apostle, Rom. 5. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19. makes the Plaister as large as the Disease: Here the Benefit of Christs Death is made as large as Adam's Sin.*

Ans. 1. The Apostle is there speaking of the Two Seeds. Adam's Sin has ruined all Adam's Seed, which is all Mankind; Christ saves, dyes for, and justifies all his Seed; which is not all Mankind, but the Elect, and those given him by the Father, *John* 6. 37.

2. Those Christ saves, the Apostle saith, they are actually justified, and are by Christ put into a state of Justification of Life, which none but the Saints are.

Third Error of the Anabaptists is this, That God affords all Men universal and sufficient Grace, and consequently a Power of Free-will to be saved if they will. For thus they declare themselves in their 4th. Article, viz. *All Men are at one time or other, put into such a Condition as that (through the Grace of God) they may be saved.*— And in the 18th. Article of the (miscalled) Orthodox Creed they tell us, *Gods Love is manifested to all Mankind—that all may be saved.* So that if any perish, it is not for want of the Means of Grace, but for the non improvement of the Grace of God, freely offered through Christ. And in this Doctrine *Papists, Socinians, Arminians, and Anabaptists*, are all agreed. This is a Doctrine of a very mischievous and malignant Consequence, as learned *Pemble* has shown. But to hew it down, consider all Men and Women in the World are either

1. Such as are out of the visible Church, viz. *Pagans, Mahometans, Jews, &c.*

2. Or such as are in the visible, viz. professing Christians, and their Infants.

1. The *Pagan* Heathen World, which are by far the greatest number. Now let us enquire what universal sufficient Grace the *Pagans* have. Many of them have never heard of Christ, never enjoyed the Gospel or Means of Salvation. Now of these we boldly deny this monstrous and erroneous Assertion. That these are strangers to the Gospel, having no sufficient Grace. The holy Scripture doth utterly condemn this; for *St. Paul* tells the *Ephesians*, That before their Conversion to Christ, and

and participation of Gospel-light, they were dead in sin, Children of Wrath, and without God, Hope, and the Covenant, *Eph. 2. 1, 2, 3, 12.* And *Matthew* testifies out of *Isaiah*, *Mat. 4. 14, 15.* That the *Gentiles* before they had Gospel-light sate in darkness, and in the Regions of the shadow of Death. Thus the Condition of the Nations in their pure Naturals, is so significantly exprest, that nothing can be clearer than that the Estate without the Gospel was a dark and dolesome Night; and for the Means to come out of this Estate, the Scripture assures us they had none. God favoured them not, nor had any regard to bestow saving Grace on them, *Acts 4. 16.* The Ordinances they had not, *Psal. 147. 19, 20.* A Preacher they had not: *And how shall we hear without a preacher, Rom. 10. 14.* Natural abilities to understand the Mysteries of the Kingdom they had not; for the natural man neither doth, nor can perceive the things of the Spirit, *1 Cor. 2. 14.*

Thus this Rotten Pillar of universal Grace is overthrown.

2. Then the Question will be of Persons in the visible Church, Whether God doth afford to every one of them sufficient Grace for their Conversion? It's necessary in order to Conversion,

1. That a person sit under the Ministry of the Word faithfully preached, *Rom. 10. 14, 15, 16, 17.* Where Vision fails the people perish. Now multitudes in the visible Church do not enjoy a faithful Ministry; some none at all; others, only such as are sent in Judgment; that daub with untempered Morter, never likely to do those any good that sit under their Ministry, *Jer. 23. 32.*

2. It's necessary to Salvation that the Consciences of persons be awakned, and stirred under the Ministry of the Word, so as to be convinced of sin, our undone Condition, and need of Christ: *The whole need not a physician, but those that are sick.* Without this Conviction none will come to Christ. Now this Conviction is only from the Holy Spirit, who bloweth where he listeth, *John 16. 8. John 3. 8.* Persons may sit under the best Ministry, and yet never thus convinced.

3. And beyond all this, there must be a divine powerful drawing of the Soul to Christ by the Spirit. And
till

Will this divine irresistible Power be put forth, no Soul comes savingly, *John* 6. 37, 44. Meer Swasions and Gospel-Arguments convert none: Regeneration, a new Heart, are the immediate Effects of a Divine Power. Now this saving powerful Operation of Christ on the Heart, is not afforded to all; if it were, all would come; for all thus drawn and taught of God do come, *John* 6. 45. And not a Soul that is not thus drawn and taught of God can ever come, or believe in him, as is abundantly evident from Christs words, *John* 10. 25, 26, 27, 28.

So that you see this *Anabaptistical* Doctrine of universal Grace, is but a lying Invention of their own, that has no footing in God's Word, and is a Doctrine detested by all *Protestant* Churches.

Fourth Error the *Anabaptists* hold is, viz. That a person truly justified and sanctified, and so a Branch in Christ united to him, may yet fall away and be eternally damned. For these are their words, in their 18th. Article of the afore-mentioned Confession, viz. That such who are true Believers, even Branches in Christ the Vine, *John* 15. or such as have Charity out of a pure Heart, and of a good Conscience, and of Faith unfained, may nevertheless swerve from it, and become withered Branches, and burned, &c. Abominable Doctrine!

Now this is false, dangerous, and uncomfortable Doctrine. The truth is, That all whom God hath accepted in Christ, effectually called and sanctified by his Spirit, can never totally or finally fall away from the state of Grace, but shall finally and certainly persevere to the End, and be eternally saved.

This is evident from abundance of plain Scriptures, *Phil.* 1. 6. Being confident (the Greek word signifies a full certainty) of this very thing, that he that hath begun a good work in you, will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ. Let the inquisitive Reader turn to these Scriptures, *John* 10. 28, 29. 2 *Pet.* 1. 10. 1 *John* 3. 9. 1 *Pet.* 1. 5, 9. *Jer.* 32. 40. These, with many other places, prove the Saints shall persevere.

Arg. 1. The Perseverance of the Saints is sure from Gods Election. It's not possible for the Elect to perish, *Mat.* 24. 24. The Elect cannot finally be deceived, 2 *Tim.* 2. 19.

Arg. 2.

Arg. 2. If God will never recal the Grace of Sanctification, then the Saints shall certainly persevere. But God will never recal the Grace of Sanctification, *Rom. 11. 29.* The gifts and calling of God are without repentance. He having given saving Grace, will never recal it.

Arg. 3. If Faith be a Grace that shall never be lost, the Saints shall finally persevere. But Faith cannot be lost, *Isa. 43. 3.*

Arg. 4. If a justified person can never more become unjustified, then the Saints shall persevere. But one justified before God can never more become unjustified, *Rom. 8. 1, 33, 34.*

Object. Did not Cain, Judas, David, Peter, Demas, fall away?

Answ. 1. Cain, Judas, Demas, &c. fell away from a Profession, but not from saving Grace; for they never had any.

2. David, Solomon, Peter, &c. though they fell into sin, yet not so as to lose their Faith, Grace, and Justification; but the Root of the Matter still remained in them.

Fifth Error of the *Anabaptists* is, They disown all Ministers, Christians, and Churches of Christ, to be any Ministers, Churches, or Christians at all, but only such as are gathered in their way, that is, by Dipping. They are (I know) very unwilling the World should know that they think so; but it's a Truth: And therefore I will charge them with it. Their 14th. Article, in their afore-said Confession, runs thus, viz. *The right and only way of gathering a Church is first to Teach and then to Baptize, which is in English to Dip; and all who Preach not this, but that Scriptureless Thing of Sprinkling Infants, falsely called Baptism, &c. All such we utterly deny, forasmuch as we are commanded to have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them.*

We are you see no Churches, no Ministers, no Christians, but the unfruitful works of darkness, i. e. no better than Pagans and Infidels in their Eyes. These are our Brethren that talk so much of Love and Peace, which for my part I shall never much credit out of the mouth of an *Arminian Anabaptist*. This I urged on them in a Meeting with them: I read this Article, which they were

were very unwilling the people should have heard, and interrupted me several times while I was reading it; but when all was done, they owned it: And yet since that time have endeavoured to blind people by telling them, I did them wrong in not reading right. I need say nothing to answer this; the grossness and foulness of it is an answer to it self.

Sixth Error (which I shall but mention) is, Their employing many weak ignorant Men to Preach, that have Pride and Confidence enough to think themselves fit to Teach others, who have yet more need to be taught themselves the very first Principles of Religion.

Two Things are required in a Minister.

1. Ability for the Work. The Apostle saith, *Νέος ὄψωνος*, (1 *Tim.* 3. 6.) a new Plant lately converted, one yet unskilled in the Doctrine of the Gospel; such are apt to be puffed up with Pride: But he must be one well acquainted with the Holy Scripture, able to divide the Word aright, well acquainted with all the Truths of the Gospel, sound in the Faith, able to convince Gainsayers, *Tit.* 1. 9. one acquainted with the Language in which the Scriptures were written, a grave stayed Christian. If they would but read 2 *Tim.* 3. and *Tit.* 1. they might be there convinced that the Work of the Ministry is not so easie a Work as many make it. And 'tis these ignorant Men that think their Abilities sufficient to manage Two Callings, the Ministry and a Private Trade, that broach most of these Errours. *Theodorus* a Tanner, was the first that denied the Divinity of Christ, 194. Who is sufficient for these Things?

2. Parts and Gifts do not make a man a Minister. It may be a Lawyer that sits at the Bar, may have better Ability in the Law than the Judge on the Bench; but the Judge has a Commission to Condemn or Acquit, but the other has none. There may in a Christian Church be some that have better Parts and Gifts than the Minister, but he is Christ's Commission-Officer, consecrated and set apart for this Thing. The Ministry is an Office, and besides Parts there must be a lawful sending. No Man taketh this Honour to himself, but he that was called of God, as was *Aaron*. Now this Call is Twofold:

1. A Call from the Church, i. e. A Minister ought not
to

to be thrust upon a People against their Wills, but the majority of the Church are to choose their Pastor ; but tho' the People choose him, and call him to take charge of their Souls, yet have they no power to make him an Officer : Ordination is not in their power ; he must be solemnly set apart for the Ministry by Fasting, Prayer, and the Imposition of the Hands of the Presbytery ; and none ought to Preach and Administer the Sacraments, but those only who are thus qualified ; called and ordained as the Scripture does witness, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. *Acts* 14. 23. *Titus* 1. 5. And let those that run without a Commission remember *Uzziah*, 2 *Chron.* 26. 16.

I might tax the *Anabaptists* as guilty in other things ; but fearing I have tired my Reader, I shall conclude with this Request to thee, Christian Reader, to joyn heartily with me in Prayer to God, that he would please thoroughly to purge his Floor ; to show every one of us our own spots and blemishes ; and to be hearty in reforming what ever bears not conformity to the Word : That he would pluck up every Plant not of his own planting, and fill the Earth with the knowledge of the Lord, and the Minds of professing Christians, tho' of different Perswasions, with Light, Love and Peace.

I would desire my Brethren of the other Perswasion, whose Errours I have been pleading against, to believe, that while I am thus opposing their Errours, I heartily love their Persons, and desire their Edification, Reformation and Salvation ; and whatever I have said through this whole Discourse (tho' perhaps they may think I have sometimes been too sharp upon them) I have done it in the fear of God, and with good assurance of the Truth of what I have said : And 'tis only love to Truth, zeal to Christ and Souls, that put me on, and carried me through it ; and if they can convince me by Gods Word of any Error or Mistake, I promise, by Divine Aid, to own it, and leave it ; but whilst I have that clear satisfaction that I have, that Christ and Truth are on my side, I hope they will not take it ill that I go on cheerfully in the defence of it.

And as for my Brethren the particular *Anabaptists*, I hope they will not look on themselves as much concerned in this Controversie ; for as they are generally persons

of peaceable spirits, so they generally scruple not Communion with us. 'Tis true, I have asserted Infants right to the Covenant and Baptism; as also the Mode of Dipping not to be Baptizing; and in so doing I have done what I am convincingly satisfied is Gospel Truth: And though this I know will not please them, yet as I heartily love, and can comfortably receive any of them notwithstanding they are not with me in that point, and can bear with them, and give them the right hand of Fellowship as Brethren, if they have no other Error, let them but be like-minded to me, and the peace and quiet of the Church will never be interrupted by either of us.

No, this stone is flung at the head of the general *Anabaptists*: And although I would think and hope as well as possibly I can of them, hoping there are some Consciencious Persons amongst them, yet must I needs say, that as I have proved them guilty of very dangerous Doctrines, so their ill Opinions are one cause why they too oft are notoriously different in their Morals, there generally appearing amongst them little of that serious Godliness which is among other Christians; so that if they would, it's not so comfortable to joyn with them as the other.

Now which Party Mr. *Collins* pretends to be of I know not; his setting the Infants of all dying in Infancy in an equal capacity of Salvation, saying, *All are saved by the imputation of Christs Righteousness*, while he denies their Faith in *Semine*, seems to me not only rank *Arminianism*, but a new way to Heaven; to be Justified without Faith, directly contrary to Scripture. And if Reverend Mr. *Mence* were alive again, I doubt not but he would venture once again to call this *Mountebank Divinity*.

F I N I S.